THE

HISTORY

OF THE

POPES.

As many RECEIPTS *have been disposed of to Persons, whose Names are not yet come to my Knowlege, I must beg Leave to defer the List of Subscribers till the Publication of the Second Volume.*

Archibald Bower.

THE HISTORY OF THE POPES,

FROM THE

Foundation of the SEE of *ROME*,

TO THE

PRESENT TIME.

VOL. I.

By ARCHIBALD BOWER, *Esq*;

Heretofore Public Professor of Rhetoric, History, *and* Philosophy, *in the Universities of* Rome, Fermo, *and* Macerata,

And, in the latter Place, Counsellor of the Inquisition.

LONDON:

Printed for the AUTHOR:

And Sold by A. MILLAR, over-against *Catharine-Street* in the *Strand*: And by W. SANDBY, opposite to *St. Dunstan*'s Church, *Fleet-Street*.

M.DCC.XLVIII.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

TO THE

KING.

Sir,

IT is not only as having the happineſs to be Your ſubject that I beg Your permiſſion to lay this Book at Your feet. In whatever part of the world I had been born, or had reſided, I ſhould have deſired to preſent it to Your Majeſty, as the Great Protector of the Reformed Religion, and worthily filling that Throne, which, above any in *Europe*, is the chief Bulwark againſt the Papal Power, and all its pernicious attendants. The wonderful riſe,

and

and monſtrous growth of that Power, almoſt to the ruin of all true Religion, and all the Civil rights of mankind, will be delineated in the courſe of this Work, which I flatter myſelf may be of ſome Uſe to the Proteſtant Cauſe. For next to the light of the Goſpel there is nothing that Popery has more to fear, than that of hiſtorical Truth: It is a teſt which the pretenſions and doctrines of *Rome* can never abide; and therefore ſhe has uſed her utmoſt endeavours, not only to lock up the Goſpel from the eyes of the Laity, and prefer her own Comments, Decrees, and Traditions, to the authority of the Scriptures, but to corrupt, diſguiſe, and falſify Hiſtory, in which neceſſary buſineſs her ableſt pens have been employed. To take off thoſe diſguiſes, and diſcover thoſe falſhoods, is conſequently a task becoming the zeal of a good Proteſtant; and my intention at leaſt, though not my performance, encourages me to hope for Your Majeſty's Gracious Protection.

In the latter part of this Hiſtory I ſhall have often the pleaſure to ſhew, how great an Inſtrument under God the Power and Strength of this kingdom has been, to maintain and ſupport the Reformation all over *Europe*. But I muſt alſo ſhew

with concern, that from the death of our wiſe Queen *Elizabeth*, the Princes of the Houſe of *Stuart*, inſtead of purſuing that glorious Plan, which ſhe had traced out, were either remiſs in the cauſe, or wholly forſook it; ſo that had not the Revolution providentially happened, and in conſequence of it the Houſe of *Brunſwick* been called to the Throne of theſe kingdoms, the Reformed Religion would, in all probability, have not only been loſt in *Great Britain*, or at leaſt under a ſtate of ſevere perſecution, but would have been in great danger every where elſe, from ſuch a change in the Ballance of Power as that event muſt have produced. The ſupport of Your Royal Family is therefore moſt neceſſary, even upon motives of ſelf-preſervation, to every Proteſtant both here and abroad. May a due ſenſe of that important connection between Your ſafety and Theirs, be always kept alive in their minds. May our Holy Religion continue to flouriſh under Your Majeſty's care, and that of Your Royal Poſterity, to the lateſt times. May neither the open attacks, nor ſecret machinations of *Rome* prevail againſt it. And may it produce all the Fruits that ought to ſpring from it, the truly-chriſtian ſpirit of Toleration, univerſal charity, good morals, good learning, freedom of thought, and candour of

mind.

mind. I need add no other wiſhes, or prayers to theſe: They comprehend all happineſs to Your Majeſty, to Your Royal Family, and to my Country; and they come from the heart of,

Sir,

Your Majeſty's

Moſt Loyal,

Moſt Faithful,

And moſt devoted Subject,

ARCHIBALD BOWER.

THE PREFACE.

THE Work, which I now offer to the Public, I undertook ſome years ſince at *Rome*, and brought it down to the Pontificate of *Victor*, that is, to the cloſe of the Second Century. As I was then a moſt zealous champion for the Pope's Supremacy, which was held as an article of Faith by the body I belonged to, my chief deſign, when I engaged in ſuch a work, was, to aſcertain that Supremacy, by ſhewing, century by century, that, from the Apoſtles times to the preſent, it had ever been acknowledged by the Catholic Church. But alas! I ſoon perceived that I had undertaken more than it was in my power to perform. Nay, while, in order to ſupport and maintain this cauſe, I examined, with particular attention, the writings of the Apoſtles, and of the many pious and learned men who had flouriſhed in the three firſt centuries of the church, I was ſo far from finding any thing that ſeemed the leaſt to conntenance ſuch a doctrine, that, on the contrary, it appeared evident, beyond all diſpute, that, during the above-mentioned period of time, it had been utterly unknown to the Chriſtian world. In ſpite then of my endeavours to the contrary, Reaſon getting the better of the ſtrongeſt prejudices, I began to look upon the Pope's Supremacy, not only as a prerogative quite chimerical, but as the moſt impudent attempt that had ever been made: I ſay, in ſpite of my endeavours to the contrary; for I was very unwilling to give up a point, upon which I had been taught by *Bellarmine*, that *the whole of*

Chriſtianity depended (*a*); eſpecially in a country, where a man cannot help being afraid even of his own thoughts, ſince upon the leaſt ſuſpicion of his only calling in queſtion any of the received opinions, he may depend upon his being ſoon convinced by more cogent arguments, than any in *Mood* and *Figure*. But great is the power of truth; and at laſt it prevailed: I became a proſelyte to the opinion which I had propoſed to confute; and ſincerely abjured, in my mind, that which I had ignorantly undertaken to defend.

Being thus fully convinced, that the Pope's ſo much boaſted Supremacy was a bold and ungodly uſurpation, I could not help cenſuring with myſelf the men of learning, who had countenaced ſuch a pretenſion, eſpecially the two great champions of the Papal power, *Bellarmine* and *Baronius*. Did they not ſee what every man, who but dips into the primitive writers, muſt ſee, what is obvious to common ſenſe? The poor ſhifts they are often put to; their ridiculous evaſions and cavils, their unmeaning diſtinctions, their wreſting ſeveral paſſages, contrary to the plain and natural meaning of the authors they quote, and, above all, their unſatisfactory anſwers to the objections of the adverſe party, ſhew but too plainly, that they wrote not from conviction, nor aimed at truth, but, perpaps, at the *red Hat*, which was afterwards beſtowed upon them, as a reward for betraying the truth. Few have wrote in defence of the Pope's ſupremacy, that have not been preferred; and none perhaps who had not preferment in view. *Æneas Sylvius*, afterwards *Pius* II. being aſked, before he was raiſed to the Papal chair, How it happened, that, in all diſputtes between the Popes and the councils, many Divines ſided with the former, and very few with the latter? *Becauſe the Popes*, anſwered he, *have benefices to give, and the councils have none.* Had he been aſked the ſame queſtion after he was Pope, he

(*a*) Bellar. Præf. de Sum. Pont.

would

would not perhaps have returned the ſame anſwer; but ſaid, upon his being put in mind of it, as *Gregory* XIII. did afterwards on a like occaſion, that *being raiſed higher, he ſaw better and farther.* Thoſe therefore who have ſtood up in defence of the liberty of the church againſt Papal Uſurpation, cannot be ſuppoſed to have had any other inducement to eſpouſe the cauſe of truth, but truth itſelf. And this ſome have had the Chriſtian courage to do even in *Italy*, and almoſt in the Pope's hearing, at the peril of their liberty, of their lives, of all that was dear to them; as I ſhall have occaſion to ſhew hereafter. But to return, in the mean time, to the preſent Hiſtory: I no ſooner found myſelf in a country where truth might be uttered without danger, than I reſolved to reſume and purſue, in my native tongue, as ſoon as I recovered the uſe of it, the work I had begun in a foreign language. On the one ſide I ſaw the only obſtruction to an undertaking, which had already coſt me no ſmall pains and labour, happily removed; while I flattered myſelf on the other, that as a complete *Hiſtory of the Popes* was ſtill wanting, ſuch a performance might meet with a favourable reception from the public. I am well appriſed, that others have, at different times, and in different languages, treated the ſame ſubject: but whether any of their ſeveral works may deſerve the name of a *complete*, or even of a *tolerable Hiſtory*, I leave thoſe to judge who have peruſed them; and ſhall only ſay in reſpect to myſelf, that, inſtead of diverting me from undertaking the ſame province, they have more than any thing elſe encouraged me to it. *Anaſtaſius* and *Platina*, the two *Claſſics*, as they are deemed, in this branch of Hiſtory, have indeed given us the *Lives of the Popes*, from the foundation of the See of *Rome* to their times, but in ſo broken, imperfect, and unſatisfactory a manner, that from them we learn but very little, even concerning thoſe of whom they have ſaid moſt. It was not their deſign to write

a Hiſtory, but only to draw, as it were in miniature, the portraits of the *Roman* Biſhops, by relating, in a ſummary way, ſuch of their actions, as appeared to them moſt worthy of being recorded; and, to ſay the truth, they have both betrayed no leſs want of diſcernment in chuſing what they ſhould relate, than of exactneſs in relating what they had choſen.

Anaſtaſius the monk, ſurnamed *Bibliothecarius*, that is, Library-keeper, Secretary, and Chancellor of the Church of *Rome* (for all theſe employments antiently centered in one perſon, and were compriſed under the common name of *Bibliothecarius*), flouriſhed in the ninth century, under *Nicolas* I. *Adrian* II. and *John* VIII. He wrote a ſuccinct account of the Biſhops, who governed the Church of *Rome*, from S. *Peter* to *Nicolas* I, who died in 867. But the memoirs he made uſe of were none of the beſt. In his time the world was over-run with forged or corrupted Pontificals, Martyrologies, Legends, &c. which were then no leſs univerſally received, than they have been ſince rejected by the learned of all perſuaſions. However, that from theſe the *Bibliothecarian* borrowed the greater part of his materials, at leaſt for the ſix firſt centuries, is but too apparent from his overlooking, nay, and often contradicting, the unexceptionable teſtimonies of cotemporary writers; as will be ſeen in the ſequel of the preſent Hiſtory. As therefore the records, which he copied, are ſo juſtly ſuſpected, and his own authority can be of no weight with reſpect to thoſe diſtant times, the reader muſt not be ſurprized to find, that, in this Hiſtory, I have paid no manner of regard to an author, who has been hitherto blindly followed by thoſe, who have wrote on the ſame ſubject. There may indeed be ſome truth in what he relates; but his frequent miſtakes render that truth too precarious to be relied on, unleſs confirmed by the concurring teſtimonies of other more credible and leſs credulous authors. However, in the times leſs re-

mote from his own, I ſhall readily allow his authority its due weight; the rather, as he ſeems not to have wrote with a deſign of impoſing upon others, but to have been impoſed upon himſelf by frauds and forgeries; for he wrote in an age, when the world lay involved in the thickeſt miſt of ignorance, when ſuperſtition and credulity triumphed without controul, and ſpurious pieces, filled with idle and improbable ſtories, had thruſt every grave writer, nay, and the Goſpels themſelves, out of doors.

Platina, ſo called from the *Latin* name of *Piadena*, a village in the *Cremoneſe*, the place of his nativity (for his true name was *Battiſta*, or *Bartolomeo Sacchi*), flouriſhed ſix hundred years after *Anaſtaſius*, that is, in the fifteenth century, under *Calixtus* III, *Pius* II, *Paul* II, and *Sixtus* IV. Under *Pius* II. he was ſecretary of the *Datary*, the office where vacant benefices are diſpoſed of; but being diſmiſſed by *Paul* II, tho' he had purchaſed the place, in the height of his reſentment, he appealed to the *future council*. What he ſuffered under that Pope, firſt in priſon, and afterwards on the rack, we ſhall hear from himſelf, in a more proper place. *Sixtus* IV, the ſucceſſor of *Paul*, well appriſed of his innocence, took him into favour, and, having enlarged, endowed, and enriched the *Vatican* library with a great number of valuable books, in different languages, he committed the care of them to him. It was probably at this time that he wrote, or rather tranſcribed, the Lives of the Popes from S. *Peter*, whom he ſuppoſes the founder of that See, to *Paul* II, who died in 1471. I ſay *tranſcribed*; for, if we except the few Popes who lived in or near his own times, *viz.* *Eugene* IV, *Nicolas* V, *Calixtus* III, *Pius* II, and *Paul* II, he copied, almoſt verbatim, all he has ſaid of the reſt, only interweaving now and then the pro-

fane

ſane hiſtory with the eccleſiaſtic (*b*). The Lives of the fourteen ſucceeding Popes, from *Paul* II, to *Pius* V, elected in 1566, were compiled by *Onuphrius Panvinius*, of the *Auguſtin* order, a man more commendable for his learning, than for his candor and veracity. Theſe are, as we may ſtile them, the original compilers of the Lives of the Popes: *Platina* adopted *Anaſtaſius*'s conciſe method of writing, and *Panvinius*, *Platina*'s, contenting themſelves with bare hints; and thereby putting their readers to the trouble of conſulting other writers, in order to gratify the curioſity they had raiſed. *Much has been ſaid of the Popes by other Hiſtorians, but very little by their own*, as the learned *Pagi* obſerved, after comparing the authors I have mentioned, with the cotemporary Hiſtorians of other nations. I might well add, that the *very little* they have ſaid has been thought too much; whence ſome of them, and *Platina* in particular, have been made, in all their Editions ſince the middle of the ſixteenth century, to ſpeak with more reſerve, and to ſuppreſs or diſguiſe ſome truths they had formerly told.

As for thoſe who in later times have engaged in the ſame province, we need only dip into their works to be ſatisfied, that to ſearch out truth was not their buſineſs. Some are all praiſe and panegyric, others all ſatire and gall: ſome have made it their ſtudy to excuſe the worſt of Popes, others to arraign the beſt. That many of the Popes have been wicked men, abandonedly wicked, is undeniable, notwithſtanding the pains that have been taken to extenuate their crimes; but neither are there

(*b*) The authors he thus copied were *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius*, from S. *Peter*, or rather *Linus*, to *Nicolas* I; *Gulielmus*, likewiſe *Bibliothecarius*, from *Nicolas* I. to *Alexander* II; *Pandulphus Piſanus*, from *Alexander* II to *Honorius* II; *Martinus Polonus*, from *Honorius* II to *Honorius* IV; *Theodorus* of *Niem*, from *Honorius* IV to *Urban* VI, and from *Urban* VI to *Martin* V, who died in 1431; other writers, whoſe works are extant, but their names unknown. He likewiſe borrowed a great deal of *Ptolemæus Lucenſis*, a *Dominican* friar, who flouriſhed, and compiled the Lives of the Popes, in the time of *Boniface* VIII, choſen in the year 1294.

wanting ſome good men among them, of innocent lives and unblemiſhed characters, whoſe only crime is their having been Popes; and to miſrepreſent or miſconſtrue the virtuous actions of theſe, as ſome have done, is no leſs blameable in an Hiſtorian, than to diſſemble or gloſs over the criminal actions of the others. This partiality may be eaſily accounted for with reſpect to one great period of the preſent Hiſtory. During the quarrels and wars between the Popes and Emperors, which laſted many years, and occaſioned, in ſeventy-eight battles, the deſtruction of an infinite number of innocent people, two powerful factions reigned, as is well known, both in *Germany* and *Italy*, diſtinguiſhed by the names of *Guelphs* and *Ghibbelines*; the former being zealouſly attached to the Papal and the latter to the imperial Intereſt. In the midſt of theſe diſtractions few writers ſtood neuter, but ſiding, according to their different intereſts or inclinations, with one party or the other, drew their pens, each againſt the head of the party he oppoſed, with more rage than the ſoldiers did their ſwords. And hence it is, that we find the ſame facts related by cotemporary authors with ſuch different circumſtances; the ſame perſons, the Emperors eſpecially and the Popes, painted in ſuch different colours. Of this very few Writers in the later times have been aware; and therefore have, as their bias led them to favour one cauſe more than the other, adopted as undoubted truths the many groundleſs aſperſions and undeſerved reproaches which party zeal had ſuggeſted to the *Ghibbelines* againſt the Popes, or to the *Guelphs* againſt the Emperors. I wiſh I could intirely clear an eminent *Italian* hiſtorian of our own times from this imputation.

But, after all, as it was not merely with a view to ſupply the want of a complete Hiſtory of the Popes, that I formerly undertook ſo laborious a taſk; neither is it now with that view alone I reſume it. What I propoſed to myſelf, when I firſt undertook

dertook it, I have ſaid already; but being convinced that I laboured in vain, and convinced by ſuch evidence as the ſtrongeſt prejudice could not withſtand, I thought it a duty owing to truth, to ſet it forth to others in the ſame irreſiſtible light; and to defend, at leaſt with as much zeal, the beſt of cauſes, as I had done the worſt. A diſloyal ſubject, who had taken up arms againſt his lawful Sovereign, would not be thought intirely to comply with his duty, by only laying them down: he ought, if actuated by a true ſpirit of loyalty, and truly convinced of the badneſs of his cauſe, to range himſelf under the banners of his injured Lord, and devote to his ſervice and defence the ſword he had drawn againſt him. By a like obligation, a writer, who has, even ignorantly, combated truth, is bound, not only to lay down his pen, as ſoon as he finds himſelf engaged in a bad cauſe, but, when occaſion offers, to turn againſt error in favour of truth the very weapon he had employed againſt truth in favour of error.

But to give the reader ſome account of the Hiſtory itſelf, and the method I have purſued in delivering it: I have intituled it, *The Hiſtory of the Popes*; but might as well have ſtyled it, *The Hiſtory of Popery*; ſince it not only contains an account of the Lives and Actions of the Popes, but of every *Popiſh* tenet; when, by whom, on what occaſion, and to ſerve what purpoſe, each of them was broached; thoſe more eſpecially which relate to the Pope as *Chriſt's Vicar upon earth*, as *the Supreme Head of the Church*, as *an Infallible Guide to ſalvation*; for theſe are the prerogatives he claims, as entailed upon, and inſeparable from the *Roman* See. But that no ſuch doctrines were known in the firſt and pureſt ages of Chriſtianity; that the Biſhop of *Rome* was then, nay and thought himſelf, upon the level with other Biſhops; that the Catholic Church acknowledged no power, authority, or juriſdiction in the Biſhop of *Rome*, but what was common to him with all other

Biſhops,

Biſhops, will appear ſo plain from the following Hiſtory, that I can hardly conceive it poſſible for any man, however prejudiced in favour of the *Papal Power*, and *Popiſh Religion*, to peruſe it without abjuring the one and the other: I am but too well appriſed of the ſtrength of prejudice; but, ſtrong as it is, it can never be proof againſt plain matter of fact. For who can believe, for inſtance, in the Pope's Infallibility, who can help looking upon ſuch an article of belief as the groſſeſt affront that ever was offered to human underſtanding, when he reads of a *Liberius* admitting and ſigning the *Arian* creed, or confeſſion of faith, declared heretical by all his Succeſſors; of an *Honorius* condemned by the Fathers of the ſixth Oecumenical Council, as *an organ of the devil*, for holding the hereſy of the *Monothelites*; of *John* XXII. preaching up and propagating, both by his Miſſionaries and his Legates *a latere*, a doctrine, which he himſelf retracted on his death-bed; of ſeven Popes (*c*) curſing and damning, in emulation of one another, all who denied a certain tenet (*d*), and anothet Pope (*e*) as heartily curſing and damning all who maintained it, nay and recurring to the *Ultima Ratio* of the later Popes, the *Fagot*, in order to *root out of the Church* (theſe are his very words) *ſo peſtilential, erroneous, heretical, and blaſphemous* a doctrine? This occaſioned great ſcandal in the Church, inſomuch that ſome even took the liberty to repreſent to his Holineſs, that the Decrees and Conſtitutions of one Pope could not be reverſed by another. The Pope replied (and what other reply could he

(*c*) *Gregory* IX, *Innocent* IV, *Alexander* IV, *Nicolas* III, *Martin* IV, *Nicolas* IV, *Clement* V.

(*d*) That the *Franciſcan* Friars had no property, in common or in private; a queſtion, if any ever was, *de lana caprina*. What was it to mankind? what to the Chriſtian religion, whether a few Friars had, or had not, any property? No man was the better for believing they had, no man the worſe for believing they had not. And yet to read the bulls of the Popes one would think, that the whole of Chriſtianity had been at ſtake.

(*e*) *John* XXII.

 make?),

make?), *That they were miſtaken, ſince it might be proved by innumerable inſtances, that what had been decreed wrong or amiſs by one Pope or Council, could be rectified and amended by another.* This anſwer ſilenced them at once, ſays our Hiſtorian: And well it might; I am only ſurpriſed, that the word *Infallibility* has ever been ſince heard of. The *Franciſcan* Friars, who had occaſioned the diſpute, paid dear for it: As they continued to plead the Infallibility of ſeven Popes againſt that of one, and obſtinately adhered to their doctrine, Pope *John*, loſing all patience, ordered all to be burnt alive, who did not receive his Conſtitution; which was done accordingly, and many of thoſe unhappy wretches choſe rather to expire in the flames than to yield. Theſe remarkable tranſactions are related by ſeveral cotemporary writers of unqueſtionable authority, and among the reſt by *Nicolaus Eymericus*, who was Inquiſitor of the province of *Tarragon*, and has inſerted them in his *Directorium Inquiſitorum* (*f*). Other facts without number, of the ſame nature, and alike irreconcileable with the other prerogatives claimed by the Popes, as well as with the chief articles of the *Roman Catholic* religion, will occur in this Hiſtory, and all ſo well atteſted, that nothing, I think, can withſtand the force of Truth thus diſplayed. Logical arguments and controverſial reaſoning cannot be well adapted to every underſtanding, and therefore are not always attended with the deſired effect, however ſkilfully managed; but hiſtorical facts lie level to the meaneſt capacities, and the conſequences thence deducible are to the meaneſt capacities plain and obvious. It is true, the Sticklers for the See of *Rome* have endeavoured to darken the cleareſt facts, ſince they could not

(*f*) Direct. Inquiſ. part. ii. quæſt. 51. See alſo *Antoninus* in his *Summa theologiæ*, part. iv. tit. ii. c. 7. num. 5; *Petrus Alliacus Cameracenſis*; *Continuator Nangii ad ann.* 1333; *Joannes Gerſo in Ser. de Feſt. Paſchat. Longus in Monaſ. Ciceſter. Chronic.* and *Gobelinus Coſmodromii ætat.* vi. c 71.

have

deny them, as being vouched by their own approved authors; but they have done it in ſo aukward a manner, with ſuch abſurd, ridiculous, and unintelligible interpretations, comments, diſtinctions, &c. that, were it not well known it was their intereſt to defend that cauſe, one would be apt to think they intended rather to ridicule than defend it.

But if the Popes were originally mere Biſhops, upon the level with other Biſhops; if they had no power but what was common to them with all other Biſhops; by what means could they thus exalt themſelves above their Collegues, nay *above all that is called God?* What could induce their Collegues, and with them the greater part of the *Chriſtian* world, to acknowledge ſuch an unheard-of power, and ſubmit to a yoke of all others the moſt heavy and tyrannical? For an anſwer to theſe queſtions I refer the reader to the following Hiſtory, where he will find every branch of power, authority, or juriſdiction, claimed by the Popes, traced from its firſt origin, and the various ſteps pointed out, by which they raiſed themſelves from the loweſt beginnings to the higheſt pitch of greatneſs; which is opening a ſchool of the moſt refined policy, that ever was known or practiſed upon earth. In this reſpect we muſt own the Popes to have been, generally ſpeaking, men of extraordinary talents, the ableſt Politicians we read of in Hiſtory, Stateſmen fit to govern the world, and equal to the vaſt dominion they graſped at; a Dominion over the Minds as well as the Bodies and Eſtates of mankind; a Dominion, of all that ever were formed, the moſt wide and extenſive, as knowing no other bounds but thoſe of the earth; nay, and not even thoſe, ſince theſe mighty Princes claim to themſelves all power in heaven as well as in earth, all power over the dead as well as the living. To eſtabliſh the ſpiritual part of this wondrous Authority upon the Goſpel of *Chriſt*, which contradicts it in every line, was an undertaking of no little difficulty, and that re-

quired no common ſkill: to eſtabliſh the temporal dominion without a fleet, without an army; to ſubject to it not only the ignorant and ſuperſtitious multitude, but Kings themſelves, nay and to prevail upon them to employ both their arms and their intereſt in promoting a power evidently derogatory to and inconſiſtent with their own; was a work not to be accompliſhed but by men of ſuperior talents, thoroughly acquainted with all the arts of inſinuation and addreſs, and ſteady in purſuing, by the beſt concerted meaſures, the great point that they conſtantly had in their view.

Two things, however, concurred to facilitate, in ſome degree, the eſtabliſhing the one and the other; *viz.* the profound ignorance of the times, and the matchleſs cunning of the perſons employed by the Popes as their Emiſſaries and Agents; without which helps no impoſture was ever carried on with ſucceſs.

It was *in the night, while men ſlept*, while the earth was overſpread with the darkeſt night of ignorance, that *the enemy came, and ſowed his tares.* From the beginning of the Seventh Century to the time of the reformation Letters were utterly neglected; and in proportion to that neglect Credulity and Superſtition, the inſeparable companions of Ignorance, prevailed among the Laity even of the higheſt ranks: the little knowledge that ſtill remained (and very little did remain) was wholly confined to the Clergy, chiefly to the Monks, men moſt zealouſly attached to the intereſt of the Pope, as well knowing, that by promoting his intereſt, they promoted at the ſame time their own. It was in this period of time, in this long darkneſs of ignorance, credulity, and ſuperſtition, that the Pope and his Agents introduced maxims and notions concerning the Papal Prerogatives, very different from thoſe which the world had entertained to that time. In the beginning of the Seventh Century, that is, in the year 606, Pope

Boniface

Boniface III, a man of great addreſs, having craftily inſinuated himſelf into the favour of *Phocas*, obtained of that Traitor and Murderer (*g*) the famous Reſcript ſettling the Supremacy on the See of *Rome*, in oppoſition to the claim of the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*. As *Phocas* bore an irreconcileable hatred to *Cyriacus*, who was then veſted with the Patriarchal dignity, he was the more eaſily prevailed upon to decide the Controverſy, which had already laſted a long time between the two Sees, in favour of the See of *Rome*. If this hatred in the Uſurper was owing to the zeal of *Cyriacus* in laying before him the enormity of his crime, and exhorting him to repentance, *Boniface*, nay and his predeceſſor St. *Gregory the Great* (*h*), knew better how to make their court to men in power, than to take the leaſt notice of their ſins, however public, or mention *Repentance* in their hearing. Be that as it will, it is certain, that to this monſter of wickedneſs the Church of *Rome* owes her Supremacy. And it was this Grant from *Phocas*, that more than any thing elſe inſpired the Biſhops of *Rome* with pride and preſumption; which increaſing as their power increaſed, they were carried by degrees to all the exceſſes an unbounded ambition can ſuggeſt, when free from all curb of Conſcience, Morality, and Religion.

Yet, after all, the Supremacy granted by *Phocas* was but a Supremacy of Order and Dignity; it gave no *new* power to the Biſhop of *Rome*, but only raiſed him above his Collegues, eſpecially his Rival, the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, and made

(*g*) *Phocas* ſettled himſelf on the imperial throne by the murder of *Mauritius*, his lawful ſovereign, and the maſſacre of his ſix children, and of all his friends and relations. Five of his children he cauſed to be inhumanly butchered in the preſence of their father.

(*h*) *Gregory* ſtyles him a moſt pious and religious Prince; cauſed his image and that of his wife *Leontia*, who was no better than he, to be lodged in an oratory at *Rome*, and congratulating him on his advancement to the throne, aſcribes it to a particular Providence.

him,

him, as ſome expreſs it, *the Firſt amongſt his Equals.* But his Succeſſors, thirſting after power, and ſcorning to hold their dignity by ſo precarious a tenure as the Emperor's pleaſure, which might hereafter revoke the deciſion of *Phocas*, and give the Precedence in rank to *Conſtantinople* inſtead of *Rome*, began to diſown the favour they had received, to ſet up for themſelves, and to claim the Supremacy, as inherent by Divine Right in their See, and derived from St. *Peter*, as Chief of the Apoſtles and Head of the Church. Thus was the foundation of the Supremacy changed; and wiſely changed, according to the rules of human policy. The old foundation was no ways proportioned to the immenſe ſuperſtructure, which they now began to deſign; ſince they could claim but very little power, if any at all, in virtue of the Emperor's Grant. But the new foundation was capable of bearing whatever the moſt unbounded and aſpiring ambition could build on it. Beſides, the Biſhop of *Rome* could not challenge, by a Reſcript of the *Roman* Emperor, any Superiority over the Churches, that had no dependence on the *Roman* Empire. But a Supremacy, inherent by Divine Right in the Papal Dignity, raiſed him at once above all the Biſhops of the Catholic Church. What therefore now remained was, to improve this extenſive Supremacy into a no leſs extenſive Power and Juriſdiction. And here no time was loſt, many circumſtances concurring to promote and forward the execution of their attempt. Beſides the ignorance of the times, and the influence of the Monks, which operated ſtrongly in their behalf, the Princes of *Europe* were quarrelling among themſelves about the Weſtern parts of the *Roman* empire, and all glad to purchaſe, at any rate, the friendſhip of the Biſhop of *Rome*, who, after the famous Donation of *Pepin* in 754, had taken great ſtate upon him, and bore a conſiderable ſway in all public affairs: As for the Biſhops, and the reſt of the Secular Clergy, they looked upon the Pope,

eſpecially

eſpecially after he had added the Sword to the Keys, as their protector and defender; and were on that conſideration diſpoſed to concur in ſtrengthening his power, and rendering it formidable, tho' at the expence of their own; chuſing rather to ſubject themſelves to an Eccleſiaſtical maſter, than to ſubmit to the Civil authority. I might add, that ſome now began to mind the Fleece more than the Flock: and with That it was ſome time before the Popes thought it proper to meddle; but, when they did, they ſoon retrieved, by the haſte that they made, the time they had loſt.

Yet I do not believe that they deſigned at firſt to run thoſe lengths, or carry the Papal Prerogative to that extravagant height they afterwards did. The ſucceſs, that attended them in the purſuit of one claim, encouraged them to ſet up and purſue another. Of this no one can doubt, who peruſes with the leaſt attention the Records of thoſe ages, and compares the Popes in the beginning of the Seventh Century with the Popes in the latter end of the Eleventh. We ſhall find them, in the firſt-mentioned period of time, ſubmitting with all humility to Princes; claiming no kind of authority or juriſdiction whatſoever but in the virtue of the Canons of Councils, or the Reſcripts of Emperors; glorying, or pretending to glory, in the humble title of *Servants of ſervants*; acknowledging themſelves Subjects and Vaſſals of the Emperors, and patiently waiting the will and pleaſure of their liege Lords to take upon them the Epiſcopal dignity, or exerciſe the functions of that office. Such were the Biſhops of *Rome* in the beginning of Seventh Century. How different from thoſe in the latter end of the Eleventh! They were then veſted with the *Plenitude of all power*, both Spiritual and Temporal; above Councils, and uncontrouled by their Canons; the fountain of all Paſtoral juriſdiction and authority; and, by Divine ſanction, impowered to enact, eſtabliſh, abrogate, ſuſpend, all Eccleſiaſtical Laws

and Conſtitutions: they were then become *Lords* and *Maſters*, the moſt haughty and imperious Lords, the moſt ſevere Maſters mankind had ever groaned under: they no more begged but diſpenſed titles, boaſting a power of ſetting up Kings, and pulling them down at pleaſure; of calling them to an account, abſolving their ſubjects from their allegiance, diveſting them of their dominions, and treating in every reſpect as their ſlaves and vaſſals thoſe, whom one of their beſt and greateſt Predeceſſors (*i*) had acknowledged *ſuperior to all Men*, and thought himſelf *in duty bound to obey*. This *Plenitude of power*, as they ſtyle it, was not acquired at once, but by degrees, as I have obſerved above; ſome of the Popes being more and ſome leſs active, crafty, and aſpiring. But what is very remarkable, of the one hundred and fourteen between *Boniface* III. who laid the foundation of the Papal grandeur, and *Gregory* VII. who raiſed it to the higheſt pitch, not one ever loſt an inch of ground his Predeceſſors had gained. And thus, by conſtantly acquiring, and never parting with what they had acquired, nay, and tying the hands of their Succeſſors by the irreverſible entail of a Divine Right, they became the ſole Spiritual Lords, and had almoſt made themſelves the greateſt Temporal Lords of the whole Chriſtian world.

But by what particular means they roſe to ſuch a height of grandeur and majeſty, by what artifices and ſubtile contrivances they maintained what they had uſurped, and ſtrove to retrieve what they had loſt, when it pleaſed Divine Providence to check, and reſtrain within more narrow bounds their overgrown power, the reader will learn from the following Hiſtory. Some of the arts they have made uſe of, are of the moſt refined, and ſome of the blackeſt nature; and both I have endeavoured, in this work, to ſet forth in their trueſt light, without diſguiſe or exaggeration; thoſe more eſpecially which

(*i*) *Gregory the Great.*

the

the Popes and their Agents have formerly employed, and ſtill employ, to bring anew under their yoke, ſuch nations as have had the Chriſtian courage to ſhake it off, and aſſert that *Liberty, wherewith Chriſt hath made us free.* If I ſhall be ſo happy as thereby to keep awake and alive, in the breaſt of every true *Engliſhman*, that noble ardour, which has, on a late occaſion, exerted itſelf in ſo diſtinguiſhed a manner: if it ſhall pleaſe Heaven to ſecond my Undertaking ſo far, as to alarm by it thoſe Proteſtants, (I wiſh I might not ſay thoſe *many* Proteſtants,) who are not aware of, nor ſufficiently guarded againſt, the crafty inſinuations, the ſecret views and attempts of the Papal Emiſſaries, I ſhall think the time and pains it has coſt me abundantly paid.

I am well appriſed of the reception a work of this nature muſt meet with, and of the treatment its author muſt expect, both at home and abroad, from the Popiſh Zealots. But let them vent their zeal in what manner they pleaſe, I ſhall neither anſwer nor reſent their reproaches and cenſures, however malignant and groundleſs: nay, I ſhall hear them with as much pleaſure and ſatisfaction as I ſhould the praiſes and commendations of others; it being no leſs meritorious in a writer to have diſpleaſed the enemies of Truth, than to have pleaſed the friends. And Theſe, I flatter myſelf, will find no great room for cenſure: it would grieve me if they ſhould, ſince I have done all that lay in my power to leave none. I have advanced nothing, for which I have not ſufficient vouchers: and theſe I have taken care to quote in the margin, that the reader, by recurring to the places pointed out in each author, may be convinced of my ſincerity and candor. I have always preferred the cotemporary writers, when equally credible, to thoſe who wrote after, tho' not without taking notice of their diſagreement; and ſuch as flouriſhed neareſt the times when the tranſactions happened, which they relate, to thoſe who lived at a

greater diſtance. Purſuant to this rule, in delivering the Lives of the Biſhops who governed the Church of *Rome* during the Firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, I have confined myſelf wholly to the Primitive writers, truſting no Modern any farther, than as he wrote from the Ancients. From theſe there is no Appeal; it is by them, and them alone, that the Papal Supremacy muſt ſtand or fall. If they have all conſpired to miſrepreſent the ſenſe of the ages in which they lived (and it is only by this hypotheſis that the Supremacy can be ſupported), in what other monuments ſhall we ſearch for it?

The Partiality, which I have ſo much complained of above in the works of others, I have taken all poſſible care to avoid in my own; checking the very firſt emotions of that zeal, which, on my reflecting how long, and how groſly I had been impoſed upon, would, if not carefully watched, have proved as ſtrong a bias in me againſt the *Pope*, and the *Popiſh Religion*, as the oppoſite zeal has proved for them in others. The vices and vicious actions of the bad Popes I have not diſſembled; but neither have I magnified them: the virtues and commendable actions of the good Popes I have neither leſſened nor miſconſtrued; nay, I have more than once juſtified the conduct and character of ſome pious men among them, greatly injured by their own Hiſtorians, becauſe they lived, and ſuffered mankind to live, in peace; applying themſelves ſolely, as it became good Biſhops, to the diſcharge of their Paſtoral duty. Theſe their Hiſtorians have ſtrangely miſrepreſented, meaſuring the merit of each Pope by the great things they atchieved, no matter by what means, for the exaltation of their See; which, in other terms, is meaſuring their Merit by their Pride and Ambition.

The Length of this Hiſtory requires, I preſume, no Apology. Every one knows, that the Popes acted, for ſeveral ages, as the Umpires of *Europe*, or rather as the Sovereigns; ſeveral

Princes

Princes being actually their vaſſals, and the reſt affecting to pay them the ſame reſpect as if they were. This emboldened them to intermeddle in the public affairs of each State and Kingdom; inſomuch, that no remarkable event happened, no revolution, no change of government or conſtitution, which they did not either promote or oppoſe, as it ſuited their intereſt, with too many of them the only ſtandard of right and wrong; and their authority, through the ignorance, credulity, and ſuperſtition of thoſe unhappy times, was, generally ſpeaking, of ſuch weight, as to turn the ſcale into which it was thrown. Beſides, they had, in every Kingdom and Nation, their Legates or Vicars, who, together with the Clergy, formed, as it were, a ſeparate State, and one Kingdom or Empire within another. Theſe, at the inſtigation of the Popes, their Lords and Maſters, were conſtantly encroaching on the Civil Authority and Juriſdiction, on the Rights of the People, and Prerogatives of Princes. Hence aroſe innumerable diſputes, which, if Princes did not comply with their demands, ended in anathemas, interdicts, civil wars, rebellions, private aſſaſſinations, and public maſſacres. Thoſe who are verſed in the Hiſtories of other nations, as well as in that of our own, and know what a conſiderable part the detail of theſe fatal diſputes takes up in the particular Hiſtories of each State and Kingdom, will not find fault with the Length of this, which, if complete, and as ſuch I offer it to the public, muſt compriſe them all. Beſides, I have given a ſummary account of the many Hereſies that have ſprung up in the Church; of the Councils that have been held; of the religious and military Orders; of their Founders, inſtitutions, fundamental laws, *&c*; ſubjects all, in ſome degree, connected with the Hiſtory of the Popes.

I do not doubt, but this Work will meet with a favourable Reception from *Proteſtants* of all denominations; ſuch a Reception, I mean, as is due to Truth. It will, I flatter myſelf,

retard,

retard, at leaſt, the daily increaſe of the Papal intereſt in theſe happy Kingdoms. As for the *Roman Catholics* here, would they but lay aſide their prejudices, ſo far as to peruſe it with the leaſt degree of candor and attention, I am confident Truth would exert its power no leſs efficaciouſly upon ſome of them, than it has done upon me. They cannot ſurely be more biaſſed in favour of the errors they have been brought up in, than I was. In them Truth has but one enemy to contend with, Education; in me it had two, Education and Intereſt; and the latter is but too often the more powerful of the two. What I forfeited by adhering to Truth, moſt of the *Roman Catholics* in *England* well know; and I am very confident none of them can ſay, that I have ever yet reaped, or ſought to reap, the leaſt temporal benefit from it. If therefore the Power of Truth, when duly diſplayed, is ſo great, as to triumph thus over the combined force of Education and Intereſt, we may well hope, that it will, at leaſt in ſome, triumph over Education alone: I moſt heartily wiſh it may in all.

THE

HISTORY

OF THE

POPES,

OR

BISHOPS of *ROME*.

St. *PETER*.

IT is out of ſome Regard to an antient Tradition, that I have placed St. *Peter* at the Head of the Biſhops of *Rome*, though I am well appriſed, that this, like moſt other Traditions, will hardly ſtand the Teſt of a ſtrict and impartial Examination. To avoid being impoſed upon, we ought to treat Tradition as we do a notorious and known Lyer, to whom we give no Credit, unleſs what he ſays is confirmed to us by ſome Perſon of undoubted Veracity. If it is affirmed by him alone, we can at moſt but ſuſpend our Belief, not rejecting it as falſe, becauſe a Lyer may ſometimes ſpeak Truth; but we cannot, upon his bare Authority, admit it as true. Now that St. *Peter* was at *Rome*, that he was Biſhop of *Rome*, we are told by Tradition alone, which, at the ſame time, tells us of ſo many ſtrange Circumſtances attending his coming to that Metropolis, his ſtaying in it, his withdrawing from it, *&c.* that, in the Opinion of every unprejudiced Man, the Whole muſt ſavour ſtrongly of Romance. Thus we are told, that St. *Peter* went to *Rome* chiefly to

That St. Peter was ever at Rome, known only by Tradition.

Tradition not to be depended upon.

oppoſe *Simon*, the celebrated Magician; that, at their firſt Interview, at which *Nero* himſelf was preſent, he flew up into the Air, in the Sight of the Emperor, and the whole City; but that the Devil, who had thus raiſed him, ſtruck with Dread and Terror at the Name of *Jeſus*, whom the Apoſtle invoked, let him fall to the Ground, by which Fall he broke his Legs. Should you queſtion the Truth of this Tradition at *Rome*, they would ſhew you the Prints of St. *Peter*'s Knees in the Stone, on which he kneeled on this Occaſion, and another Stone ſtill dyed with the Blood of the Magician (A).

Fabulous Accounts of St. Peter.

The *Romans*, as we are told, highly incenſed againſt him for thus maiming, and bringing to Diſgrace, one to whom they paid divine Honours, vowed his Deſtruction; whereupon the Apoſtle thought it adviſable to retire for a while from the City, and had already reached the Gate, when, to his great Surprize, he met our Saviour coming in, as he went out, who, upon St. *Peter*'s asking him where he was going, returned this Anſwer, *I am going to* Rome *to be crucified anew*; which, as St. *Peter* underſtood it, was upbraiding him with his Flight; whereupon he turned back, and was ſoon after ſeized by the provoked *Romans*, and, by an Order from the Emperor, crucified. Theſe, and a thouſand like Stories, however fabulous and romantic they may ſeem, we cannot, without great Incoherency, reject, if we admit St. *Peter* to have been at *Rome*, ſince the Whole is equally vouched by the ſame Authority, and has been upon the ſame Authority equally believed by thoſe, who are called in by the Advocates for the See of *Rome*, to witneſs St. *Peter*'s having preached the Goſpel in that City. Theſe are *Arnobius* [a], *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* [b], *Euſebius* [c], *Irenæus* [d], *Tertullian* [e], *Jerom* [f], and *Juſtin* the Martyr [g]. Theſe have all ſuppoſed St. *Peter* to have been at *Rome*, and, together with St. *Paul*, to have planted Chriſtianity in that great Metropolis of the World: but this they took upon Tradition, and conſequently their Authority is of no greater Weight than Tradition itſelf, which had they duly examined, they would not perhaps have ſo rea-

The greateſt Men impoſed upon by falſe Traditions.

[a] Arnob. l. 2. in Gent. [b] Cyril. catech. 6. [c] Euſeb. l. 2. c. 14. [d] Iren. l. 2. c. 20. [e] Tert. de anim. c. 24. [f] Hier. de vir. illuſtr. c. 2. [g] Juſtin. apol. 2.

(A) This Account ſeems to have been borrowed from *Suetonius*, who ſpeaks of a Perſon that, in the public Sports, undertook to fly in the Preſence of the Emperor *Nero*, but, on his firſt Attempt, fell to the Ground; by which Fall his Blood ſprung out with ſuch Violence, that it reached the Emperor's Canopy (1).

(1) Suet. l. 6. c. 12.

dily

dily pinned their Faith upon it. False and lying Traditions are of an early Date, and the greatest Men have, out of a pious Credulity, suffered themselves to be imposed upon by them. How many Traditions, after having reigned for Ages without Controul, were upon the Reformation, when Men took the Liberty to examine what they believed, rejected by the Church, ashamed to own them, and degraded into popular Errors! But that of St. *Peter's* having been at *Rome*, and the first Bishop of that City, was a Tradition of too great Consequence not to be maintained at all Events, since upon that chiefly was founded the Claim of his pretended Successors to an uncontrouled Authority, and universal Jurisdiction; a Foundation infinitely too weak for such an immense Superstructure.

How little regard paid to them by some Popes.

And here I cannot help observing the little Regard that the Popes themselves have shewn to Tradition, though received by the greatest Lights of the Church, when it did not promote the Honour or Interest of their See. Of this we have a glaring Instance in a parallel Case; for as St. *Peter*, according to Tradition, travelled to *Rome*, so did St. *Paul*, according to Tradition, travel into *Spain*: the former Tradition was received by the Writers I have quoted above, and the latter by some of the same Writers, *viz.* by *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* [h], and *Jerome* [i], and by *Athanasius* [k], *Chrysostom* [l], *Theodoret* [m], *Gregory* the Great [n], and many others; yet such a Tradition was rejected, perhaps justly, by Pope *Innocent* I. who would not allow St. *Paul* to have ever been in *Spain* [o]. Have we not an equal Right to question, or even to deny, St. *Peter's* having ever been at *Rome*? Are not the Authorities at least equal on both Sides? Why then must the Travels of one Apostle be looked upon as an Article of Faith, and those of the other be deemed fabulous?

No Mention in the Scripture of St. Peter's *having ever been at* Rome.

And truly, if we examine narrowly into this matter, the former Tradition will appear no less groundless to us, than the latter did to that Pope: for, in the first Place, neither St. *Peter* himself, nor any of the Sacred Writers, give us the least Hint or Intimation of his having ever been at *Rome*. We are told of his being at *Antioch*, at *Jerusalem*, at *Corinth*, at *Babylon* [p]; but of the great Metropolis of the Empire, where he is supposed to have fixed his See, not the

[h] Cyr. cat. 17. [i] Hier. in Isai. xi. 14. [k] Athan. ad Drac. [l] Chrys. ad Hebr. præf. [m] Theod. in 2 Tim. iv. 17. [n] Greg. in Joh. xxiii. 22. [o] Concil. tom. 2. p. 1245. [p] Act. xi. 2. xv. 7. Gal. i. 18. ii. 9. Gal. ii. 11. 1 Pet. v. 13. 2 Cor. i. 12.

leaſt Mention is made. And may we not from that Silence queſtion, to ſay no more, his having ever been there? I know that by *Babylon*, from whence St. *Peter* wrote his firſt Epiſtle [q], *Euſebius* [r], *Jerom* [s], the Venerable *Bede* [t], *Oecumenius* [u], and *Grotius* [w], underſtood *Rome*; but this is a bare Conjecture, and no better grounded than that of others, who thought that by *Babylon* was meant *Jeruſalem* [x]. The learned Doctor *Pearſon*, Biſhop of *Cheſter*, ſeeing no occaſion here to recur to a figurative Senſe, is of Opinion, that the above-mentioned Epiſtle was written not from *Babylon* in *Chaldæa*, which then lay in Ruins, but from *Babylon* in *Egypt*; and no Man has taken more Pains to make the World believe, that St. *Peter* preached at *Rome*, and founded that See [y]. But, in this Controverſy, the Silence of St. *Paul* in particular, if duly attended to, muſt be thought, by every unbiaſſed Man, a far more convincing Proof of St. *Peter*'s not having been at *Rome*, than all the Authorities that have been yet alleged, are of his having been there. For that Apoſtle, while at *Rome*, had frequent Opportunities of mentioning his fellow Apoſtle, and fellow Labourer; and yet, naming ſeveral others, he is quite ſilent as to him. From *Rome* he wrote to the *Galatians*, to the *Epheſians*, to the *Philippians*, to the *Coloſſians*, to *Timothy*, and to *Philemon*, without ever mentioning *Peter*, or ſending any Salutation from him; nay, it is certain, that St. *Peter* was not at *Rome* when the Apoſtle of the Gentiles wrote to the *Coloſſians*; for, mentioning *Tychicus*, *Oneſimus*, *Ariſtarchus*, *Marcus*, and *Juſtus*, he adds, *Theſe alone, my Fellow-workers unto the Kingdom of God, who have been a Comfort unto me* [z]. *Peter* was not there, when St. *Paul* wrote his ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, where he ſays, *At my firſt Anſwer no Man ſtood with me, but all Men forſook me* [a]: nor was he there immediately before St. *Paul*'s Death, when *the Time of his Departure was at hand*; for he tells *Timothy*, that *all the Brethren did ſalute him*; and, naming *Eubulus*, *Pudens*, *Linus*, and *Claudia* [b], he omits *Peter*, whom we may thence conclude not to have been there. And yet it is a received Tradition in the Church of *Rome*, that St. *Peter* was then not only in that Metropolis, but confined and bound in the ſame Priſon with St. *Paul*. As that Apo-

St. Paul, *in the many Letters he wrote from* Rome, *never mentions St.* Peter.

[q] 1 Pet. v. 13. [r] Euſeb. l. 2. c. 15. [s] Hier. vir. illuſt. c. 8. [t] Bed. tom. 5. p. 713. [u] Oecu. p. 526. [w] Grot. ſynopſ. in Pet. [x] Vide Grot. ib. p. 1541. [y] Pearſ. oper. poſth. p. 56. & ſeq. [z] Coloſſ. iv. 11. [a] 2 Tim. iv. 6. [b] Ibid. iv. 21.

ſtle,

ſtle, in writing from *Rome*, ſends no Salutations from *Peter*, ſo in writing to *Rome* he greets many others, but never mentions him [c]. Now who would not ſooner chooſe to reject ſuch Traditions, than to ſuppoſe St. *Paul* guilty of ſuch an unfriendly and unaccountable Omiſſion?

St. Peter, *though at* Rome, *not Biſhop of* Rome.

From what has been hitherto ſaid, every impartial Judge muſt conclude, that it is, at leaſt, very much to be doubted whether St. *Peter* was ever at *Rome*; but, allowing him to have been there, it ſtill remains to be proved, that he was Biſhop of that See. This the Sticklers for the Papal Authority ſpare no Pains to make out, being well appriſed, that the Whole of their Cauſe lies here at ſtake; and yet I find nothing alleged by them in ſo material a Point, but a few miſinterpreted Paſſages out of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers: for the right Underſtanding of which it is to be obſerved, that ſuch of the Antients as called *Peter* Biſhop of *Rome*, and *Rome* the *Place*, the *Chair*, the *See* of *Peter*, meant no more than that he was Superintendant of that Church, that he founded it by converting Men to the Faith, and erected the epiſcopal Chair, by appointing the firſt Biſhops. That this was their true Meaning, is apparent from what we read in *Ruffinus*; who, having mentioned *Linus*, *Cletus*, and *Clemens*, as ſucceeding each other in the See of *Rome*, while *Peter* was ſtill alive, thus accounts for their Epiſcopacy: They were, ſays he, appointed Biſhops by *Peter*, to the end that, they taking upon them the epiſcopal Charge, he might be at Leiſure to diſcharge the Duties of his apoſtolical Office. And this, he tells us, was not a Notion of his own, but the common Opinion [d]. *Irenæus* ſpeaks to the ſame Purpoſe: *The Apoſtles*, ſays he, *founding that Church, delivered the epiſcopal Office into the Hands of* Linus [e]. Hence the moſt antient Writers, who lived neareſt the Fountain of Tradition, never ſtile St. *Peter* Biſhop of *Rome*, but only ſay, that, by ordaining Biſhops, he founded that Church [f]. St. *Peter* therefore was not Biſhop of *Rome* in the ſtrict Senſe, to which that Word is now confined, but in the more large Senſe, of which I have taken notice above: and in that St. *Paul* has as good a Claim to the high-ſounding Titles of *Pope*, *Biſhop of* Rome, *&c.* as St. *Peter*, ſince, together with him, he is ſaid to have founded that Church. The Popes indeed will not allow him that Honour, nor condeſcend to reckon

In what ſenſe St. Peter *and St.* Paul *ſtyled Biſhops of* Rome.

[c] Ad Rom. xvi. 3—15. [d] Ruffin. in præf. ad Clem. recogn. [e] Iren. apud Euſeb. c. 5. 6. [f] Conſtit. Apoſt. 7. 46. Iren. 3. 3.

him

him among their Predeceſſors; but *Epiphanius* and *Euſebius* have been more complaiſant; of whom the former ſays, Peter *and* Paul *were the firſt at* Rome, *both Biſhops and Apoſtles* [g]; and the latter, ſpeaking of the Succeſſion of the Biſhops of *Rome*, Alexander *derived his Succeſſion in the fifth Place from* Peter *and* Paul [h]. Both therefore were Biſhops of *Rome*, or neither; both in the Senſe of the antient Writers, but neither in that, which is now annexed to the Word *Biſhop*. And truly the Office of an Apoſtle, and that of a Biſhop, as the Word is now underſtood, are incompatible. An Apoſtle, ſays *Chryſoſtom* [i], is charged with the Inſtruction not of any particular Nation or City, but of the whole World; but a Biſhop muſt reſide, ſays the ſame Writer [k], and be employed in one Place: and therefore St. *Peter*, who knew theſe two Duties to be inconſiſtent, if he was ever at *Rome*, committed there, as he did in other Places, the epiſcopal Charge to others, and purſued his apoſtolical Office, which required a more extenſive Care.

The Duties of a Biſhop and an Apoſtle inconſiſtent.

Whether James *the Apoſtle was Biſhop of* Jeruſalem.

But St. *James*, ſay the Popiſh Writers, though an Apoſtle, was appointed Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*; and why might not St. *Peter*, though an Apoſtle, undertake the Epiſcopacy of *Rome*? It is ſurpriſing they ſhould lay ſo much Streſs as they do on this Objection, ſince they muſt know it to be grounded on an Uncertainty; as *Euſebius*, the greateſt Antiquary of former Times [l], *Hegeſippus* the moſt antient Hiſtorian [m], *Epiphanius* [n], *Jerom* [o], *Gregory* of *Nyſſe* [p], *Chryſoſtom* [q], and many others, reckon *James* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, not among the *Apoſtles*, but the Seventy Diſciples. Of the ſame Opinion, among the Moderns, are *Grotius* [r], Dr. *Hammond* [s], *Valeſius* [t], *Blondel* [u], and *Salmaſius* [w]. The laſt of theſe ſaying, after his poſitive and confident manner, *It is certain that he was not one of the Twelve*, I may at leaſt ſay, it is not certain that he was; and conſequently the Objection can be of no conſiderable Weight. But allowing him to have been one of the Twelve, as ſome of the Antients ſeem to think [x], there was a ſpecial Reaſon, why one of the Apoſtles ſhould be appointed to reſide at *Jeruſalem*, that City being the Metropolis, the Fountain, the Centre of the Chriſtian Religion; our Faith had

[g] Epiph. hær. 7. [h] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 2. [i] Chryſ. tom. 8. p. 115. [k] Idem Eph. iv. 11. [l] Euſeb. l. 1. c. 12. [m] Hegeſ. apud Euſeb. l. 2. c. 23. [n] Epiph. hær. 78. [o] Hier. de vir. ill. [p] Greg. p. 279. [q] Chryſ. in Mat. hom. 33. [r] Grot. in Jac. 1. 1. [s] Hamm. diſſert. Ignat. 4. 3. [t] Val. in Euſeb. 1. 12. [u] Blond. in epiſt. Clem. ad Jacob. [w] Wal. Meſſ. p. 20. [x] Aug. cont. Creſ. l. 2. c. 37. Vide Pearſ. Ann. Paulin. p. 58.

there had its Birth; the Church was there very numerous, conſiſting of many Thouſands of believing *Jews* [y]; and thither reſorted great Numbers of thoſe of that Nation, who were converted to Chriſt in other Countries. On theſe Conſiderations it might ſeem expedient that a Perſon of the greateſt Authority ſhould preſide there. But there was no ſpecial Reaſon why an Apoſtle ſhould conſtantly reſide at any other Place, nor does it appear that any did: St. *Peter* eſpecially could not reſide at any one Place, ſince to him, as *the Apoſtle if the Circumciſion*, was committed the Charge of converting the diſperſed *Jews* in all Parts of the World.

As for the Appellations of the *Apoſtolic See, Chair, Throne*, &c. given by the Antients to the See of *Rome*, they import no more than that it was erected by an Apoſtle; for they are beſtowed indiſcriminately on all the Sees, in which Biſhops had been placed by the Apoſtles; *viz.* of *Epheſus* [z], of *Smyrna* [a], of *Alexandria* [b], of *Corinth*, *Theſſalonica*, *Philippi* [b], &c. The Title of *Apoſtolic See*, common to many, was, in Proceſs of Time, by the Ambition of the Biſhops of *Rome*, appropriated to their own. They had, as they thought, till the Year 1662. a pregnant Proof not only of St. *Peter*'s erecting their Chair, but of his ſitting in it himſelf; for till that Year, the very Chair, on which they believed, or would make others believe, he had ſat, was ſhewn and expoſed to public Adoration on the 18th of *January*, the Feſtival of the ſaid Chair. But while it was cleaning, in order to be ſet up in ſome conſpicuous Place of the *Vatican*, the Twelve Labours of *Hercules* unluckily appeared engraved on it. Our Worſhip however, ſays *Giacomo Bartolini*, who was preſent at this Diſcovery, and relates it, was not miſplaced, ſince it was not to the Wood we paid it, but to the Prince of the Apoſtles St. *Peter* [c]. An Author of no mean Character, unwilling to give up the holy Chair, even after this Diſcovery, as having a Place, and a peculiar Solemnity among the other Saints, has attempted to explain the Labours of *Hercules* in a myſtical Senſe, as Emblems repreſenting the future Exploits of the *Popes* [d]. But the ridiculous and diſtorted Conceits of that Writer are not worthy our Notice, tho' by *Clement* X. they were judged not unworthy of a Reward.

What meant by the Apoſtolic See, Chair, Throne, &c.

[y] Act. xxi. 20. [z] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. [a] Idem ib. et Tertull. de præſ. hæret. c. 32. Euſeb. l. 3. c. 36. [b] Tertull. ib. c. 36. [c] Bartol. Antichitá ſacre di Roma, p. 32.
[d] Lucheſini catedra reſtituita a S. Pietro.

But

St. Peter *how, or by whom, placed in the See of* Rome.

But to return to our Subject; it may be inquired, If St. *Peter* was Biſhop of *Rome*, who placed him in that See? Did our Lord appoint him? Did the Apoſtles name him? Did the People chooſe him? Did he aſſume it himſelf? To theſe Queries no Anſwers have been yet given, but ſuch as are ſo ridiculouſly weak, that it is not worth my while to relate them, nor the Readers to hear them. *Bellarmine*, in one place, poſitively affirms, that *God commanded St.* Peter *to fix his See at* Rome [e]; but elſewhere contents himſelf with ſaying, *It is not improbable that God commanded St.* Peter *to fix his See at* Rome [f]. If it is no more than not improbable, it is uncertain; it may be a mere Conjecture, a Dream.

Other Biſhops of Rome *appointed by St.* Peter.

St. *Peter*, either alone, or jointly with St. *Paul*, as we read in *Irenæus*, and in the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions [g], appointed other Biſhops of *Rome*. Now, when he appointed others, did he reſign his Epiſcopacy, or retain it? If he reſigned it, he did not die Biſhop of *Rome*; which ſhakes the very Foundation of the Pope's Claim to Supremacy: if he retained it, there were Two Biſhops on the ſame See at one time; which Pope *Innocent* I. in his Epiſtle to the Clergy and People of *Conſtantinople*, condemned as an Irregularity never known till his Time [h]: he did not, it ſeems, recollect that it had been practiſed by his Predeceſſor Pope *Peter*. *Theodoret* tells us, in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, that when the Emperor *Conſtantius* would have had *Felix* to ſit in the See of *Rome*, together with *Liberius*, upon the Return of the latter from Baniſhment, the People of *Rome* would not conſent to it, crying out, *One God, one Chriſt, one Biſhop*. *Felix* died ſoon after, and upon his Death *Theodoret* makes the following Remark: *It was*, ſays he, *a ſpecial Providence, that* Peter's *Throne might not ſuffer Infamy, being held by Two Prelates* [i]. He did not conſider, or rather did not believe, that it had been held by St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, by St. *Peter* and by *Linus*.

St. Peter Biſhop *at* Rome, *not of* Rome.

To conclude, St. *Peter* was perhaps Biſhop at *Rome*, not of *Rome* (B). He was Biſhop at *Rome*, if he ever was there, being, in virtue of his Apoſtleſhip, impowered to diſcharge, at *Rome*, and every-where elſe, all epiſcopal Functions; but was not ſpecially Biſhop of *Rome*, or any other Place; that is, he did not take upon him the Charge of

[e] Bell. de ſum. Pont. l. 4. c. 4. [f] Idem ib. l. 2. c. 12. [g] Iren. apud Euſeb. l. 5. c. 6. et Conſt. Apoſt. l. 7. c. 46. [h] Inn. I. apud Soz. l. 8. c. 26. [i] Theod. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 2. c. 17.

(B) 'Tis a Diſtinction made by a Pope, *King in* Etruria, *not of* Etruria.

any

any particular Biſhop, the Adminiſtration of any particular Biſhoprick, that being inconſiſtent both with the Dignity and Office of an Apoſtle, or univerſal Biſhop.

Nero, Galba, Otho,

LINUS,

Vitellius, Vespasian, Titus.

Firſt Bishop *of* Rome.

THERE is a great Diſagreement among the Antients about the firſt Biſhops of *Rome*: *Tertullian* makes *Clement*, whom he ſuppoſes to have been ordained by St. *Peter*, the immediate *Succeſſor of that Apoſtle* [a]. He was followed therein by *Ruffinus* [b], and *Ruffinus* by the *Latins* in general; among whom that Opinion univerſally prevailed towards the End of the fourth Century. But *Jerom*, rejecting the Opinion of the *Latins*, places *Linus* immediately after the Apoſtles, *Anacletus* next to him, and *Clement* in the third Place [c]. His Opinion is ſupported by the Authority of *Irenæus* [d], *Euſebius* [e], *Theodoret* [f], and likewiſe of *Epiphanius* [g], *Optatus Milevitanus* [h], and St. *Auguſtin* [i], with this Difference, that *Epiphanius* gives the Name of *Cletus* to the Succeſſor of *Linus*, and both *Optatus* and St. *Auguſtin* place him after *Clement*; but in this they all agree, that *Linus* was the firſt, after the Apoſtles, who governed the Church of *Rome*. To the Authority of theſe Writers I may add that of the Apoſtolic Conſtitutions, telling us, in expreſs Terms, that *Linus* was ordained Biſhop of *Rome* by St. *Paul* [k]. As to what we read in *Tertullian* and *Ruffinus*, *viz.* that *Clement* was ordained by St. *Peter*, and named to ſucceed him, Dr. *Hammond* anſwers, That *Clement* governed with epiſcopal Power and Juriſdiction the converted *Jews*, while *Linus* and *Anacletus* governed, with the ſame Power, the converted Gentiles. He adds, That, upon the Death of *Anacletus*, both Churches were united under him [l]. Thus he ſtrives to reconcile the Opinion of the *Latins*, placing *Clement* immediately after the Apoſtles, with that of the *Greeks*, allowing him only

Year of Chriſt 66. Linus, *and not* Clemens, *the firſt Biſhop of* Rome.

Whether Clement *appointed by* St. Peter, *ſucceed him.*

[a] Tert. de præſc. hæret. c. 32. [b] Recog. p. 398. [c] Hier. vir. illuſt. c. 15. [d] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. [e] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 2. 4. 21. [f] Theod. in 2 Tim. iv. 21. [g] Epiph. hær. 27. c. 6. [h] Optat. l. 2. p. 48. [i] Aug. ep. 165. [k] Conſt. Apoſt. l. 7. c. 46. [l] Hamm. l. 5. c. 1.

the third Place: for, granting what he advances to be true, and Reasons are not wanting to support it, *Clement* was, agreeably to the Opinion of the *Latins*, the immediate Successor of the Apostles, with respect to the *Jews*; but, with respect to the Gentiles, he succeeded *Anacletus*, agreeably to the Opinion of the *Greeks* [m]. This Answer *Cotelerius* applauds as an ingenious, learned, and probable Solution; but, at the same time, rejects it as contradicting, in his Opinion, the Apostolic Constitutions, and not supported by the Authority of any antient Writer [n]. The learned Dr. *Pearson* will admit no Opinion that supposes Two Bishops to have presided together in one City [o], that being an Irregularity, according to St. *Cyprian* [p], *contrary to the Ecclesiastic Disposition, contrary to the Evangelic Law, contrary to the Rules of the Catholic Institution*, and condemned as such by the Council of *Nice* [q]. It is very much to be doubted, as I have shewn above, whether St. *Peter* ever was at *Rome*, and consequently whether *Clement* was ordained, by him, Bishop of that City. His not succeeding him is a Proof, that he was not; for who can imagine, that the People and Clergy of those Days would have thought of choosing any other, or that any other, though chosen, would have accepted of a Dignity, to which *Clement* had been named by St. *Peter* himself, and which he was actually possessed of at the Apostle's Death? Be that as it will, *Linus* is now universally acknowleged both by the *Greeks* and *Latins* for the first Bishop of *Rome*.

As for the Life and Actions of *Linus*, all I can find in the Antients concerning him is, that it was he whom St. *Paul* mentioned in his Epistle to *Timothy* [r]; that, upon the Authority of the Apostolic Constitutions, he was supposed by some to have been the Son of *Claudia*, whom the Apostle mentions in the same Place [s]; and that his Life and Conversation were much approved of by the People [t]. The Church of *Rome* allows him, in the Canon of the Mass, a Place among the Martyrs; but no mention is made of his having suffered for the Faith, either in the antient Martyrologies, or in *Irenæus*, who, speaking of him, and his immediate Successors, distinguishes none but *Telesphorus* with the Title of Martyr. *Baronius*, determined to maintain, right or wrong, the Credit of the sacred

Linus *no Martyr, tho' placed among the Martyrs.*

[m] Idem ib. p. 247. 258. [n] Cotel. in not. Const. p. 298. [o] Pearson. posthum. p. 159. 161. [p] Cypr. ep. 44, 46, 52, 55. [q] Syn. Nic. can. 8. [r] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. Euseb. l. 3. c. 2. Tim. iv. 21. [s] Const. Apost. l. 7. c. 46. [t] Tert. in Mar. c. 3.

Canon,

Canon, in Oppoſition to all the Antients, nay, and to his own Syſtem, cuts off one Year from the Pontificate of *Linus*, that he may place his Death under *Veſpaſian*, and not, as *Euſebius* has done [u], under *Titus*, in whoſe Reign he owns none to have ſuffered for the Faith [w]. Had he remembered what he muſt have read in *Tertullian* and *Euſebius*, he had ſaved himſelf that Trouble; for *Tertullian* aſſures us, that *Veſpaſian* made no Laws againſt the Chriſtians [x]; and *Euſebius*, that he did not moleſt them, though he cauſed a diligent Search to be made after thoſe who were of the Race of *David*, which occaſioned a dreadful Perſecution againſt the *Jews* [y]. *Linus* governed the Church of *Rome*, according to *Euſebius* [z] and *Epiphanius* [a], Twelve Years; ſo that, if we place, with them, the Death of St. *Peter*, in 66. *Linus* muſt have died in the Year 78. of the Chriſtian Æra. We have, under the Name of *Linus*, Two Books of the Martyrdom of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* [b]; but they are generally looked upon as ſuppoſititious [c]. *Trithemius* makes him the Author of the Life of St. *Peter*, in which a particular Account was given of the Diſpute between that Apoſtle, and *Simon* the Magician. This Piece has not reached our Times, and was perhaps of the ſame Stamp with the other, ſince it is never mentioned either by *Euſebius* or St. *Jerom*. The Decrees, that are aſcribed to him, are no-where to be found, but in *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius*, and ſuch like Writers, whoſe Authority is of no Weight in Matters ſo diſtant, unleſs ſupported by the Teſtimony of the Antients.

Books aſcribed to him.

TITUS, DOMITIAN.

CLETUS, *or* ANACLETUS,

Second BISHOP *of* Rome.

LINUS was ſucceeded by *Cletus*, or *Anacletus*, whom the *Greeks* conſtantly ſtyle *Anencletus*, that is, *irreprehenſible*. An Opinion has long obtained in the Church of *Rome*, diſtinguiſhing *Cletus* and *Anacletus* as Two Popes, nay, as Two Saints; the

Year of Chriſt 78.

[u] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 13. [w] Bar. Annal. ad Ann. 80. [x] Tert. apol. c. 5. [y] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 12. [z] Idem ib. c. 13. [a] Epiph. l. 27. c. 6. [b] Bib. Patr. tom. 7. [c] Vide Baron. ad Ann. 69. et Voſſ. Hiſt. Græc. l. 2. c. 9.

Festival of the one being kept on the 26th of *April*, and that of the other on the 23d of *July* [a]. But this Distinction is now given up by the most learned Men of that Church, not only as groundless, but as plainly contradicting the most celebrated Writers of Antiquity, *Irenæus*, *Eusebius*, and St. *Jerom*, to whom we may add *Caius*, a Priest of *Rome*, who, writing in the Beginning of the Third Century, reckoned *Victor* the Thirteenth Bishop of that City [b]. *Baronius*, however, spares no Pains to keep up that Distinction; but alleges nothing to countenance it, except the Poem against *Marcion*, ascribed to *Tertullian*, the Pontifical of *Anastasius*, and some Martyrologies [c]. Who was the Author of that Poem is not well known, but all agree, that it was not written by *Tertullian* [d]. Besides, the Author, whoever he was, places both *Cletus* and *Anacletus* before *Clement*; which *Baronius* condemns as a gross Mistake. As for the Pontifical, the Annalist often finds fault with it; and complains, in this very Place, that *Anastasius*'s whole Chronology is overcast with an impenetrable Mist [e]. The Martyrologies he quotes are of too modern a Date to deserve any Regard, since none of them were heard of before the Ninth Century [f]. But how, says *Baronius*, was this Distinction first introduced? We may, perhaps, account for it thus: *Irenæus*, with all the *Greeks*, and St. *Jerom*, among the *Latins*, place *Anacletus*, as we have observed above, before *Clement*; whereas St. *Austin* and *Optatus Milevitanus* place him after. This, and his being called *Cletus* by *Epiphanius*, and in several Copies of *Ruffinus*, might induce some to imagine, that as the Names and Places were different, so were the Persons. Thus, as we conjecture, of one Pope Two Popes were made, Two Saints, and Two Martyrs; for, in the Canon of the Mass, he has a Place with *Linus* among the Martyrs; though neither was acknowleged for such by *Irenæus*, or any of the Antients; nay, *Anacletus* is said, in some Pontificals, to have *died in Peace*, that is, according to the Phrase of those Days, of a natural Death [g]. *Bollandus*, after having much laboured, but laboured in vain, to maintain the Distinction between *Cletus* and *Anacletus*, yields at last, and gives up the Point. But yet, unwilling to make the least Alteration in the Catalogue of the Popes, which places, with the Approbation of the holy See, *Clement* between *Cle-*

Cletus *and* Anacletus *not two, but one Pope.*

How they were first distinguished.

[a] Martyrol. Roman. [b] Euseb. l. 5. c. 28. Pearson posthum. p. 147, 148. [c] Bar. ad Ann. 69. [d] Halloix in vit. Iren. p. 646. [e] Bar. ad Ann. 69. [f] Bolland. Pont. p. 217. [g] Vide Pearf. posthum. p. 19.

tus

tus and *Anacletus*, he ſtrives to ſave it with a new and pretty extraordinary Invention; for he pretends *Anacletus* or *Cletus* to have reſigned the Chair to *Clement*, and *Clement*, in his Turn, to have yielded it to him again. Thus, according to him, though *Cletus* and *Anacletus* are one and the ſame Perſon, yet no Fault is to be found with the Catalogue; and *Clement* is rightly placed both after and before him [h]. This is a Speculation of his own, altogether groundleſs, and therefore not worthy of a Place here, were it not to ſhew what low Shifts and Subterfuges even Men of Parts, in the Church of *Rome*, chooſe to ſubmit to, rather than to yield to Reaſon in Points that ſeem to derogate from the Authority of that See. *Anacletus* governed the Church Twelve Years, according to *Euſebius* [i]; to which ſome add Two Months, ſome Three, and ſome only one; ſo that he muſt have died in the Year 91. He is ſuppoſed to have been buried next to St. *Peter*, in the *Vatican*, where his ſuppoſed Body is ſhewn, and worſhiped to this Day [k]. We find, in the Collection of *Iſidorus Mercator*, Three Decretals, under the Name of *Cletus*; but ſuch Decretals as are anterior to the Pontificate of Pope *Syricius*, who was elected in the Year 384. are now univerſally looked upon as bare-faced Forgeries [l] (A).

Decretals aſcribed to him.

CLE-

[h] Bolland. Pont. p. 217. [i] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 15. [k] Bolland. 26 April. p. 410, 411.
[l] Vide Card. Bon. liturg. l. 1. c. 3. et Natal. Alexand. hiſt. Eccleſ. p. 743, &c.

(A) All the decretal Epiſtles of the Popes, before *Syricius*, are ſo filled with Abſurdities, Contradictions, Anachroniſms, *&c.* that they are now given up, even by the moſt ſanguine Advocates for the Papal Supremacy. And yet theſe very Decretals, abſurd as they are, and inconſiſtent with themſelves, as well as with all the genuine Writings of thoſe Times, whether ſacred or profane, were, for ſeveral Ages, the main Stays of the whole Fabric of the Papal Power. By them that Power was eſtabliſhed; by them it was ſupported; for, in the Days of Ignorance, they were univerſally received as the genuine Writings of the antient Biſhops of *Rome*, in whoſe Names they were publiſhed. And, truly, were we to rank them, as they were ranked in the monkiſh and ignorant Ages, with the Deciſions of the Oecumenical Councils, and the Canonical Books of the Scripture, no room would be left to queſtion any Branch of the unlimited Power claimed by the Popes. They were held in the greateſt Eſteem and Veneration from the Beginning of the 9th Century to the Time of the Reformation, when, upon the firſt Dawn of Learning, the Cheat was diſcovered, and the Stays removed, which till then had ſupported the unwieldy Edifice. But it was then in a Condition to ſtand by itſelf, at leaſt till new Frauds were deviſed to prop it up; and this was accordingly done, without Loſs of Time.

The Decretals of the firſt Popes are quoted, by *Bellarmine*, to prove, that the Supremacy of the Biſhops of *Rome* was univerſally acknowleged in the earlieſt Times (2): but, at the ſame time, he owns, that *he dares not affirm them to be of undoubted Authority*. And what can be more abſurd than to quote a Forgery, or what he himſelf owns may be a Forgery, in Vindication of ſo darling a Point as *the Supremacy?*

(2) Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 14.

But

DOMITIAN, NERVA, TRAJAN.

CLEMENT,

Third BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 91.

Clement *mentioned by St.* Paul.

CLEMENT, the Succeſſor of *Anacletus*, is, according to *Origen* [a], *Euſebius* [b], and all the Antients, the Perſon whom St. *Paul*, in his Epiſtle to the *Philippians* [c], names among thoſe who had *laboured with him in the Goſpel, and whoſe Names were in the Book*

[a] Origen. in Jo. p. 143. [b] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 15. [c] Philip. iv. 3.

But he did it for want of better Evidences, and muſt therefore be excuſed. *Baronius*, aſhamed to lay any Streſs on ſuch groſs and palpable Forgeries, contents himſelf with only ſaying, that the Popes had no hand in forging them; and that they never made uſe of their Authority to ſupport their own. That they were concerned in, or privy to, the forging of thoſe Letters, I dare not affirm: that but they countenanced them, as they did all other Forgeries tending to the Advancement of their See; that they received them as genuine, and endeavoured to impoſe them upon others; nay, that they made uſe of them ſoon after their firſt Appearance in the World, to eſtabliſh and promote the Authority of their See; are undoubted Matters of Fact: witneſs the Letter, which *Nicholas* I. wrote, in the Year 865. to *Hincmarus* Archbiſhop of *Rheims*, and to the other Biſhops of *France*, who, refuſing to comply with ſome exorbitant Demands of the Pope, had rejected the Decretals, on which thoſe Demands were founded, as Writings that had been lately counterfeited. *Nicholas*, in his Anſwer to them, maintains the Authenticity of thoſe Letters, exhorts all, who profeſs the Catholic Faith, to receive them *with due Veneration*, and claims, in virtue of ſuch ſacred and authentic Writings, an uncontrouled Authority over all the Churches of the World, as lodged from the Beginning in his See (3). And was not this making uſe of the ſuppoſed Authority of thoſe Decretals to promote his own? *Nicholas* ſeems to have believed the Letters to be genuine; and, if he did, he was certainly miſtaken, and erred in propoſing, as he does, ſpurious Pieces for a *firm and ſtrong Foundation* of our Belief, as well as our Practice. If he did not believe them to be genuine, and yet endeavoured to perſuade the Biſhops of *France* that they were ſo; nay, and claimed, upon the Authority of ſuch Pieces, a Power over them, and their Churches; a worſe Epithet would ſuit him better than that of *fallible*, which is common to all Men.

The firſt who publiſhed theſe Decretals was, according to *Hincmarus*, *Riculphus* Biſhop of *Mentz*, who was ſuppoſed to have brought them from *Spain*; becauſe the Name of *Iſidore* was prefixed to the Collection, and a famous Writer of that Name, *viz. Iſidore* Biſhop of *Seville*, had flouriſhed in *Spain* ſome Centuries before. But ſuch a mean and ſcandalous Undertaking is altogether unworthy of ſo great a Prelate; and beſides the Author of the ſuppoſed Decretals has copied, *verbatim*, ſome Paſſages from the Council of *Toledo* in 675. and from the Sixth Couucil in 681. whereas *Iſidore* of *Seville* died in 636. The learned *Ellies du Pin* lays this Forgery at the Door of ſome *German* or *Frenchman*, the Letters being all written in the Style of the *Germans* and *French*, of the 9th Century, and many of them addreſſed to Perſons of theſe two Nations. *Hincmarus* was miſtaken, in ſuppoſing the forged Decretals to have been firſt publiſhed by *Riculphus* of *Mentz*; for in ſome of them are found Fragments of the Council held at *Paris* in 829. and he died in 814. They were firſt uſhered into the World, and

(3) Nich. I. Ep. 42.

forged

Book of Life. Hence *Chryſoſtom* concludes, that, together with St. *Luke* and *Timothy*, he attended the Apoſtle of the Gentiles in all his Journeys [d]. *Irenæus* aſſures us, that he had not only ſeen the Apoſtles, and converſed with them; but that, when he was appointed Biſhop of *Rome*, he ſtill heard their Voices ſounding in his Ears, ſtill had before his Eyes the Rules and good Example they had given him [e]. *Origen* ſtyles him *the Diſciple of the Apoſtles* [f]; *Ruffinus*, *almoſt an Apoſtle* [g]; and *Clement* of *Alexandria*, *an Apoſtle* [h]. That he was well verſed in every Branch of Learning, eſpecially in polite Literature, deſcended of a Senatorian Family, and nearly related to the *Cæſars*, is what we read in *Eucherius* [i], and *Nilus* [k], who ſeem to have followed therein the *Recognitions*, a Book of no Authority. *Eucherius* perhaps confounded, as others have done, Pope *Clement* with *Flavius Clemens*, who was Son to *Flavius Sabinus*, the only Brother of *Veſpaſian*, and ſuffered Death for the Chriſtian Religion in the Perſecution of *Domitian* [l]; for Pope *Clement* was, as himſelf ſeems to inſinuate, rather of the Race of *Jacob* than of the *Cæſars* [m]. Upon the Death of *Anacletus* he was unanimouſly choſen by the People and Clergy of *Rome* to ſucceed him. He had been named, ſay ſome, to that Dignity by St. *Peter* himſelf, pre-

Some confound him with Flavius Clemens.

Choſen Biſhop of Rome.

[d] Chryſ. in Phil. hom. 13. [e] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. [f] Orig. Pr. in l. 3. c. 3. [g] Ruf. ad Orig. p. 195. [h] Clem. ſtrom. 4. [i] Euch. ad Val. p. 19. [k] Nil. l. 2. ep. 49. [l] Dio, l. 65. Suet. in Dom. c. 15. Orig. in Celſ. l. 1. p. 5. [m] Clem. ep. 1. c. 4.

forged too, in all likelihood, by one *Benedict*, Deacon of the Church of *Mentz*, though, in his Preface to that Collection, he would fain make us believe, that *Autcarius*, the Succeſſor of *Riculphus*, found them in the Archives of that Church, and that they had been placed there by *Riculphus*, who had brought them from *Spain*. *Autcarius*, in whoſe Time *Benedict* publiſhed his Collection, is thought to have been privy to the Impoſture. The Name of *Iſidore*, which was then very common in *Spain*, was prefixed to it, to perſuade the World, that the Decretals were brought from that Country, and not forged at *Mentz*, where they firſt appeared. However, they were ſuſpected by ſome, even in that dark Age, and abſolutely rejected by *Hincmarus* of *Rheims*, as Writings of no Authority. But the Popes, whoſe Pretenſions they were calculated to favour, exerting all their Authority to bring them into Repute, they were in the End univerſally received, and inſerted into all the Collections of Canons. At preſent they are ſo univerſally exploded, that there is not a ſingle Writer, no, not even in the Church of *Rome*, who is not aſhamed to patronize or defend them. But the Work is done, for which they were intended; and now that the Edifice can ſtand by itſelf, no matter what becomes of the Stays that ſupported it, when it could not. Theſe Decretals may be juſtly looked upon as a ſtanding Monument of the Ignorance, Superſtition, and Credulity, that univerſally prevailed in the Church, from the Beginning of the Ninth Century to the Time of the Reformation. I ſhall conclude with obſerving, that, from theſe Decretals, *Anaſtaſius the Bibliothecarian*, and after him *Platina*, have chiefly copied what they relate of the firſt Popes, ſuppoſing them to have really done what, in thoſe ſpurious Pieces, they are ſaid to have done.

ferably to *Linus* and *Anacletus* [n]; but had declined it, finding that the Faithful were not all equally disposed to submit to the Judgment and Authority of St. *Peter*. He therefore withdrew; and, as he was of a mild and pacific Disposition, led a retired Life to the Death of *Anacletus*, when he was forced to accept of the Dignity, which he had before declined. Thus *Ruffinus*, upon the Authority of the *Recognitions*; which appears to me, I must own, a very improbable Tale. During his Pontificate happened an impious and detestable Division, to use his own Terms, among the Christians of *Corinth*, which obliged them to have recourse to other Churches, especially to that of *Rome*; and on this occasion was written that famous Epistle to the *Corinthians*, so much magnified by the Antients, and publicly read, not only in the Church of *Corinth*, as *Dionysius* assures us, who was Bishop of that City in 180. but in many other Churches, to the Time of *Eusebius*, and St. *Jerom* [o], and perhaps long after. It was by some ranked among the Canonical Books of the Scripture, and by all reverenced next to them [p]. It was written in the Name of the whole Church of *Rome*, and to the whole Church it is, in express Terms, ascribed by *Irenæus* [q] and *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, who calls it the Epistle of the *Romans* to the *Corinthians* [r]. However, it was composed by *Clement*, in the Name of the Church; for, in the primitive Times, Bishops did nothing by themselves, but every thing jointly with their Churches: *We advise, we exhort, we recommend*, &c. was their usual Style; which the Popes still observe, though they mean only themselves; for they scorn to join either with the People or Clergy. The Style of this excellent Letter is plain, clear, full of Energy, without any useless Ornaments; and the Whole written with the Simplicity, as *Photius* observes [s], that the Church requires in Ecclesiastical Writers. There is so great an Affinity, both as to the Sense and the Words, between this Epistle, and the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, that some have concluded *Clement* to have been the Translator, nay, and the Author of that Epistle [t]. In *Clement*'s Epistle *Photius* discovers, as he thinks, Three Faults; *viz.* that he supposes other Worlds beyond the Ocean; that he speaks of the Phœnix as a real Bird; and that he uses Words expressing the Humanity of our Saviour, and not his Divinity. But, as

His famous Epistle to the Corinthians.

Unjustly criticized by Photius.

[n] Epiph. hær. 27. c. 6. [o] Euseb. l. 3. c. 16. Hier. vir. ill. c. 15. [p] Vide Iren. l. 3. c. 3. Euseb. l. 3. c. 16. et 38. et l. 4. c. 23. [q] Iren. ib. [r] Clem. strom. 5. [s] Phot. c. 126. [t] Euseb. l. 3. c. 38. et l. 6. c. 25. Hier. vir. ill. c. 15.

to

to the first of these Objections, there can be no Difficulty now, that we know for certain what was but doubtfully advanced by the Antients: in speaking of the Phœnix he complies with the Opinion universally received, in those Days, by the Learned, both among the Christians and Pagans. As to the Third Objection, *Photius* must not have observed, that he styles our Saviour's Sufferings the *Sufferings of God*, which was acknowleging his Divinity. This Epistle, the most precious and valuable Treasure the Church can boast, after the holy Scriptures, was for many Ages bewailed as lost; but, in 1633. it was again restored to the Christian World, by *Patricius Junius*, a *North Briton*, who published it from a Manuscript, written by an *Egyptian* Lady, named *Thecla*, about the Time of the great Council of *Nice*, and afterwards brought over into *England* [u]. That this Piece is genuine, appears from a great many Passages quoted out of it by the Antients.

Thought lost, but appears again.

The most remarkable Event that happened in the Pontificate of *Clement*, was the Persecution of *Domitian*; but what Part he bore in it we can learn from no credible Author. He died, according to *Eusebius* [w], in the Third Year of *Trajan*'s Reign, that is, in the 100th of the Christian Æra. In the Canon of the Mass he has a Place, with his Two Predecessors, among the Martyrs; but *Telesphorus*, the Sixth Bishop of *Rome*, is the first, as I have observed above, who was acknowleged as such by *Irenæus*, whose Authority is of far greater Weight than that of *Ruffinus*, or Pope *Zosimus*, who suppose him to have died for the Confession of the Faith [x]. In the Acts of *Clement*, to which *Gregory* of *Tours* gave an entire Credit [y], and after him many others, especially the Two credulous Annalists, *Baronius* [z], and *Alford* [a] in his Annals of the *British* Church, we read, that *Clement* was banished, by *Trajan*, into the *Chersonesus*, beyond the *Euxine* Sea; that there he caused a Fountain to spring up miraculously, for the Relief of the Christians confined to the same unhospitable Region; that he converted the whole Country to the Faith, which provoked the Emperor to such a degree, that he ordered him to be thrown into the Sea, with an Anchor fastened to his Neck: it is added, that, on the Anniversary of his Death, the Sea retired to the Place where he had been drowned, though Three long Miles

Clement *dies.*

His fabulous Acts.

[u] Not. Jun. p. 3. Not. Cotel. p. 8. [w] Eus. l. 3. c. 34. [x] Ruf. orig. t. 1. p. 778. Concil. per Lab. t. 2. p. 1558. [y] Greg. Tur. de glor. martyr. c. 35. [z] Bar. ad Ann. 102. [a] Alf. ad ann. eund.

from the Shore; that, upon its retiring, there appeared a moſt magnificent Temple, all of the fineſt Marble; and in the Temple a ſtately Monument, in which was found the Body of the Saint; that the Sea continued thus retiring every Year on the ſame Day, not daring, for the Space of Seven Days, to return to its uſual Bounds, that the Chriſtians might, at their Leiſure, and without Apprehenſion of Danger, perform their Devotions in Honour of the Saint: to crown the Whole, they add, that, one Year, a Mother having heedleſsly left her young Child in the Temple, upon her Return, next Year, ſhe found it not only alive, but in perfect Health [b]. No mention is made of ſuch ſtupendous Miracles by *Irenæus*, who was brought up under *Polycarp*, Biſhop of *Smyrna*, in *Aſia*, at the very Time *Clement* is ſuppoſed to have ſuffered, and who ſpeaks of him at Length. His Silence is a plain Demonſtration that they were unknown to him; and they muſt have been known, had they been true.

The Miracles he wrought, unknown to Irenæus.

Beſides the Letter to the *Corinthians*, of which I have ſpoken above, ſeveral other Pieces are aſcribed to *Clement*; *viz.* a ſecond Letter to the *Corinthians*; which is, without all Doubt, very antient; but *Euſebius* doubts whether it was written by *Clement* [c]; and both St. *Jerom* [d], and *Photius* [e], abſolutely reject it. Five other Letters, placed among the Decretals, whereof the firſt, more antient than the reſt, was tranſlated by *Ruffinus*, and is quoted by the Council of *Vaiſon*, held in 442 [f]. However, it is generally looked upon as a ſpurious Piece; for the Author of it, whoever he was, acquaints St. *James*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, who died long before St. *Peter*, with St. *Peter*'s Death [g]. *Clement*'s Itinerary, which, in *Photius's* Time, was prefixed, by way of Preface, to the *Recognitions* [h]. The *Recognitions*, relating, under the Name of *Clement*, the Actions of St. *Peter*, his Interview with *Simon* the Magician, how *Clement* himſelf knew again his Father and his Brothers, whom he had forgot; whence the whole Work took the Name of *Recognitions*, that is, *of knowing again*: it is likewiſe called the *Itinerary of St.* Peter, the *Acts of St.* Peter, the *Acts of St.* Clement [i]. The *Recognitions* are quoted by *Origen* [k], *Epiphanius* [l], and *Ruffinus* [m], as the Work of *Clement*; but theſe Writers, at the ſame time, own them to have been altered

Other Writings aſcribed to Clement.
A ſecond Letter to the Corinthians.
Five other Letters.
His Itinerary.
The Recognitions.

[b] Greg. Tur. ib. [c] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 38. [d] Hier. vir. ill. c. 15. [e] Phot. c. 113. [f] Concil. per Labb. t. 3. p. 1458. [g] Vide Blond. Decret. p. 25. 28. [h] Phot. c. 113. [i] Coteler. not. in ſcript. Apoſt. p. 353. [j] [k] Orig. Philocal. c. 23. p. 81, 82. [l] Epiph. hær. 30. c. 15. [m] Ruf. ad Orig. p. 195.

in

in ſeveral Places, and falſified by the Heretics; nay, *Epiphanius* tells us, that the *Ebionites* ſcarce left any thing ſound in them [n]. The Author was well verſed in Philoſophy, Mathematics, Aſtrology, and moſt other Sciences, but not ſo well acquainted with the Doctrine of the Church; whence his Work is abſolutely rejected by *Athanaſius* [o]; and now generally looked upon as a Piece falſly aſcribed to *Clement*. St. *Peter*'s *Dialogues* with *Apion* were probably written in the Third Century, and, to gain Credit, fathered upon *Clement*; for *Euſebius* writes, that there had lately appeared a long Work, under the Name of *Clement*, containing Dialogues between St. *Peter* and *Apion* [p]. As to the *Apoſtolic Conſtitutions*, if that Work is different from *the Doctrine of the Apoſtles*, mentioned by *Athanaſius* and *Euſebius*; *Epiphanius* is the firſt who ſpeaks of it: it appears at leaſt, from *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, that, in the Year 250. the Conſtitutions either had not yet appeared, or were of no Repute in the Church [q]. *Epiphanius* tells us, that many ſuſpected them; but, as for himſelf, he received them, ſince he found nothing in them repugnant to the Faith, or the Diſcipline of the Church [r]. But as he quotes ſeveral Paſſages out of them, which are not to be found now, we may well conclude, that, ſince his Time, they have been either altered or curtailed. The *Greeks* indeed, in the Second Canon of the Council, that, in 692. was held at *Conſtantinople*, in a Tower of the Imperial Palace, called *Trullus*, that is, the *Cupola*, declare, that they had been falſified, in ſeveral Places, by the Heretics. *Photius* thinks that, with reſpect to the Style, they fall ſhort of the *Recognitions*, but far excel them in the Purity of the Doctrine, adding, at the ſame time, that it is no eaſy Task to clear them from the Imputation of *Arianiſm* [s]. Dr. *Pearſon* takes them to be a Collection of ſeveral Pieces, publiſhed in the earlieſt Times, under the Name of the Apoſtles, and containing, as was pretended, the Inſtructions they had given [t]. *Albaſpinæus*, Biſhop of *Orange*, thinks the Matter they contain excellent, and the Whole agreeable to the Diſcipline obſerved by the *Greek* Church, during the Four firſt Centuries; but nevertheleſs he looks upon them only as a Collection of the different Cuſtoms, that were eſtabliſhed, by degrees, in the Church, and ſome of which were diſputed even in the Fourth Century [u]; ſo

St. Peter's Dialogues with Apion.

The Apoſtolic Conſtitutions.

[n] Epiph. hær. 30. p. 65. [o] Athan. ſym. p. 154. [p] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 38. [q] Ign. prol. c. 8. p. 54. [r] Epiph. hær. 76. p. 822. [s] Phot. c. 113. [t] Pearſ. in Ign. t. 1. p. 60, 61. [u] Alb. Obſer. l. 1. c. 3. p. 37, 38.

that they can by no means be aſcribed either to the Apoſtles, or to *Clement*. The *Conſtitutions* end with 85 Canons, long known by the Title of *the Canons of the Apoſtles*; but, as they contain ſeveral things that were not received in the Apoſtles Time, nor in *Clement's*, the ableſt Critics are of Opinion, that they likewiſe are but a Collection of ſeveral Decrees made in the firſt Ages of the Church, and that they were not collected into one Body till the Third Century [w]: I don't find them quoted before the Council of *Conſtantinople* in 394. The *Greeks*, in the Council of the Year 692. mentioned above, bound themſelves to the Obſervance of them; but they are all rejected by Pope *Galaſius:* however, *Dionyſius Exiguus* having, not long after, placed the firſt Fifty at the Head of his Collection, they were received by Degrees; but the other Thirty-five have not been admitted to this Day.

The Canons of the Apoſtles.

Upon the Whole, of the many Writings aſcribed to *Clement*, the firſt Letter to the *Corinthians* is the only one undoubtedly his: and what a wide Difference appears, as to the Spirit and Style, between that excellent Piece, and the Briefs, Bulls, Mandates, *&c.* of his Succeſſors? He does not command, but exhorts; he does not threaten, but intreats; he does not thunder Anathema's and Excommunications, but employs the moſt mild and gentle Perſuaſives, even with the Authors of the Schiſm. Had he known himſelf to be the infallible and unerring Judge of Controverſies, from whoſe Tribunal lay no Appeal; had the *Corinthians* believed themſelves bound, on Pain of Damnation, to ſubmit to his Deciſions, there had been no Room for Reaſons, Arguments, and Perſuaſives; he ought to have exerted the Power, with which he was veſted, and put an End to all Diſputes, in the peremptory Style of his Succeſſors, *We declare, and command all Men to comply with this our Declaration, on Pain of incurring the Indignation of the Almighty; and,* as if that were not enough, *of his bleſſed Apoſtles* Peter *and* Paul. But it was not till ſome Ages after, that the Popes found out their Infallibility, or rather their flattering Divines found it out for them; ſo that this invaluable Privilege lying dormant, Men were obliged, for a long time, to make uſe of their Reaſon, in deciding religious Controverſies.

Clement's *Infallibility unknown to him, and to the* Corinthians.

[w] Idem ib. et Ign. prol. c. 15. p. 103.

EVARISTUS,

TRAJAN.

EVARISTUS,

Fourth BISHOP *of* Rome.

CLEMENT was ſucceeded by *Evariſtus*, *Evariſtes*, or *Ariſtus*, as he is called in the moſt antient Catalogue of the Popes [a], in the Third Year of *Trajan*'s Reign, that is, in the Cloſe of the Firſt Century of the Chriſtian Æra. He governed about Nine Years, that is, to the Twelfth Year of *Trajan*, and the 109th of Chriſt [b]. *Euſebius*, in his Chronicle, ſuppoſes him to have died in the Year 107 [c]; and, in his Hiſtory, ſays, that his Death happened about the Year 109 [d]: but, in the Series and Succeſſion of the Popes, that Writer is every-where conſiſtent with himſelf in his Hiſtory, and quite otherwiſe in his Chronicle. Beſides, the Hiſtory ought to correct the Chronicle, as being poſterior to it. To *Evariſtus* are aſcribed Two Decretals, the Diſtribution of the Titles or Pariſhes of *Rome*, on which *Baronius* makes a long Deſcant [e], and an Order, that Biſhops, when they preached, ſhould be always attended by Seven Deacons [f]. But theſe, and many other things of the ſame Nature, we read only in *Baronius*, *Platina*, *Anaſtaſius*, *Ciaconius*, &c. and my Deſign is, as I have declared in the Preface, to follow the Antients alone, in the Hiſtory of the antient Popes; and therefore I ſhall take no notice of what the Moderns advance, unleſs I find it ſupported by the Authority of the original Writers.

Year of Chriſt 100.

Evariſtus *governs Nine Years.*

Several things aſcribed to him, without ſufficient Foundation.

TRAJAN, ADRIAN.

ALEXANDER,

Fifth BISHOP *of* Rome.

SIXTUS is placed, by *Optatus Milevitanus* [g], immediately after *Evariſtus*; but that is certainly a Miſtake, owing, in all likelihood, to thoſe who tranſcribed him, ſince *Irenæus* [h], *Euſebius* [i], *Epiphanius* [k], and even St. *Auguſtin* [l], who follows *Optatus* in every thing elſe relating to the Popes, place *Alexander* between *Evariſtus* and *Sixtus*. *Irenæus* reckons *Alexander* the Fifth Biſhop of *Rome*; ſo

Year of Chriſt 109.

[a] Buch. p. 270. [b] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 34. [c] Euſeb. chron. l. 4. c. 1. [d] Idem. l. 3. c. 34. [e] Bar. Ann. 112. [f] Idem, ann. 121. [g] Opt. l. 2. p. 48. [h] Iren. l. 3. c. 6. [i] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 1. [k] Epiph. hær. 27. c. 6. [l] Aug. ep. 165.

that

that we agree with the most authentic and unexceptionable Writer of Antiquity in excluding St. *Peter*, and supposing *Cletus* and *Anacletus* to be one and the same Person [m]. *Alexander* governed Ten Years and some Months, and died in the Third Year of *Adrian*, and 119 of Christ [n]. We can learn nothing of the Antients concerning him: he is worshiped indeed by the Church of *Rome* as a Martyr; but that Title is not given him by *Irenæus*: and as for the Venerable *Bede*, who ranks him among the Martyrs, he was led into that Mistake by *The Acts of St. Alexander*, which, in the Opinion of Dr. *Pearson*, were composed in the Seventh Century, but are now universally rejected as fabulous. *Platina* ascribes to Pope *Alexander* the Institution of *Holy Water* [o], which *Baronius* takes very much amiss of him, since he thereby robs the Apostles of an Honour due to them; for by the Apostles, in his Opinion, was first introduced the Use of *Holy Water* [p]. But if we trace up this *Holy Water* to the Fountain-head, we shall find that it arises from an unhallowed Spring, from the *Lustral Water* of the Pagans; for Peace being restored to the Church by *Constantine*, the Christians began, as a modern Writer well observes [q], to adopt the Ceremonies of the *Gentiles*. Several Cities in *Italy*, *France*, *Germany*, *Spain*, &c. pretend to have Reliques of this Pope, insomuch that, were they all put together, they would form at least twenty intire Bodies [r].

Alexander *not a Martyr.*

The Institution of Holy Water falsly ascribed to him.

Adrian.

SIXTUS,

Sixth Bishop *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 119.

THE Successor of *Alexander* is named *Sixtus* by *Optatus* [s], and St. *Augustin* [t]; but by *Irenæus* [u], *Eusebius* [w], *Epiphanius* [x], and *Jerom* [y], *Xystus*: which Word has some Signification annexed to it in *Greek*; whereas *Sixtus* has none either in *Greek* or *Latin*. He presided Ten Years, according to *Eusebius* [z], but not complete; for he was raised to the See in the Third Year of *Adrian*, of Christ 119. and died in the Twelfth Year of the same Prince, about the latter-end

[m] Euseb. l. 5. c. 6. [n] Idem, l. 4. c. 5. [o] Platin. in ej. vit. [p] Bar. ad ann. 132. N. 3. [q] Le Sueur, hist. de l'Egl. & de l'Emp. ad ann. 108. [r] Vid. Bolland. 3. Maii, p. 370. & Baillet vies de Saints, 3 de Maii. [s] Opt. l. 2. p. 48. [t] Aug. ep. 53. [u] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. [w] Euseb. l. 4. c. 4. [x] Epiph. hær. 27. c. 6. [y] Hier. chron. [z] Euseb. l. 3. c. 3.

of

of the Year of Chriſt 128[a]. He is ranked among the Martyrs in the Canon of the Maſs, and in all the Martyrologies: but his immediate Succeſſor is the firſt to whom that Title is given by *Irenæus*. To *Sixtus* are aſcribed two Decretals, but both forged in latter Ages, as plainly appears from *De Marca*, from *Baluzius*; and above all, from the haughty Title of *Univerſal Biſhop*, which *Sixtus* is made to aſſume in one of them: a Title, as *F. Pagi* is forced to confeſs, unknown to the Biſhops of the primitive and beſt Times[b]. The Title of *Univerſal* would be better adapted to the Reliques of this Pope, than to his Epiſcopacy; for they are diſperſed all over the Roman Catholic World: but *Baillet* himſelf looks upon them as falſe, and unworthy of the Worſhip that is paid to them, not excepting even thoſe that were given by *Clement* X. to Cardinal *De Retz*, who cauſed them to be placed with great Solemnity in the Abbey of St. *Michael* in *Lorrain*[c].

Decretals falſly aſcribed to Sixtus.

His Reliques.

ADRIAN, **TELESPHORUS**, ANTONINUS PIUS.

Seventh BISHOP *of* Rome.

SIXTUS was ſucceeded by *Teleſphorus* (or, as ſome ſtyle him, *Theleſphorus*), the Seventh Biſhop of the See of *Rome*[d]. To him is aſcribed, in ſome Editions of the Chronicle of *Euſebius*, the Inſtitution of *Lent*[e]; but in none of the beſt Editions Mention is made of ſuch an Inſtitution, and ſcarce in any Manuſcripts[f]. *Baronius* endeavours to prove, that this Faſt was inſtituted by the Apoſtles, and that *Teleſphorus* eſtabliſhed it for ever by a Decree; but his Arguments are ſo weak, that he deſerves rather to be pitied than anſwered. He introduces too early the Biſhops of *Rome* iſſuing Decrees, and preſcribing Laws to the whole Church. *Teleſphorus* was the firſt Biſhop of *Rome* who ſuffered Death for the Chriſtian Religion, ſeeing *Irenæus* diſtinguiſhes him with the Title of Martyr[g], which this Author gives to none of his Predeceſſors; but as to the Particulars of his Death the

Year of Chriſt 128.

Teleſphorus *the firſt Biſhop of* Rome *Martyr.*

[a] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 4, & 5. [b] Pagi in vit. Sixt. [c] Baill. ib. 6. d'Auril.
[d] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. Euſeb. l. 4. c. 5. [e] Bar. ad ann. 154. [f] Not. Scal. in chron. 216. Not. Pont. in chron. p. 612. [g] Iren. l. 3. c. 3.

Antients have left us quite in the Dark. He suffered in the Eleventh Year of his Pontificate, the First of *Antoninus Pius*, and 139 of Christ [h].

ANTONINUS PIUS.

HYGINUS,

Eighth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 139.

HYGINUS, the Successor of *Telesphorus*, governed the Church but Four Years, and those not complete; for, in 142, we find *Pius* already in that See [i]. In his Time the two famous Heretics, *Valentine* and *Cerdo*, came to *Rome*; the former from *Egypt*, and the latter from *Syria*, to display their new Doctrine in that great Metropolis. *Hyginus* no doubt opposed them with all the Zeal of a primitive Bishop; but, in spite of his Zeal, they gained a great many Proselytes to their heterodox Opinions [k]. His Infallibility, had it been then known and believed, would have soon put a Stop to the growing Evil. The Church of *Rome* honours *Hyginus* among her Martyrs, but none of the Antients give him that Title. To him is ascribed the Use of Godfathers and Godmothers in Baptism, and the Ceremony of Consecrating Churches; but upon no better Grounds than the two Decretals are fathered upon him, which are, by all the Learned, rejected as spurious. *Hyginus* died in the Year 142, the Fourth or Fifth of *Antoninus Pius*; and is supposed to have been buried near St. *Peter* [l].

The two Heretics, Valentine *and* Cerdo, *come to* Rome.

ANTONINUS PIUS.

PIUS,

Ninth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 142.

ANICETUS is placed next to *Hyginus* by *Optatus* [m], St. *Augustin* [n], and *Epiphanius* [o]: But who would not, with *Eusebius* [p], rather follow *Irenæus* [q], and *Hegesippus* [r], naming *Pius* immediately after *Hyginus*, since the former wrote in the Time of *Eleutherius* the Se-

[h] Euseb. l. 4. c. 10. [i] Idem, l. 4. c. 11. [k] Iren. l. 3. c. 4. Philas. c. 44. Epiph. hær. 41. c. 1. [l] Bolland. April. p. 22 [m] Opt. l. 2. p. 48. [n] Aug. ep. 53. [o] Epiph. hær. 42. [p] Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. [q] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. [r] Apud Euseb. l. 4. c. 22.

cond

cond Biſhop after *Anicetus*; and the latter lived at *Rome* in the Time of *Anicetus*, and continued there till the Pontificate of *Eleutherius*.

In the Time of *Pius*, *Marcion*, a Native of *Pontus*, and the Son of a Biſhop of the holy Catholic Church, ſays *Epiphanius* [t], being excommunicated by his Father for debauching a Virgin, and finding he could by no means prevail upon the venerable Prelate to receive him again into the Church, abandoned his native City, ſuppoſed to be *Sinope*, and fled to *Rome*. Upon his Arrival there, he applied to the Elders of that Church, intreating them to admit him to their Communion. But thoſe holy Men, who had been taught by the Diſciples of the Apoſtles, inſtead of complying with his Requeſt, returned him this Anſwer; We cannot admit you without Leave from your holy Father; nor can we, as we are all united in the ſame Faith, and the ſame Sentiments, undo what our holy Collegue your Father has done.—Thus *Epiphanius* [u]. Had *Bellarmine* lived in thoſe Days, he had taught them another Doctrine, a Doctrine which, however neceſſary, the Apoſtles had forgot to deliver to their Diſciples; *viz.* That the See of *Rome* was raiſed above all other Sees; that the Appeals of the whole Catholic Church were to be brought to it; that no Appeals were to be made from it; that it was to judge of the whole Church, but be judged by none. *Marcion* did not apply to *Pius*, as the Reader muſt have obſerved, or at leaſt did not apply to him alone, but to the Elders, who diſclaimed all Power of reverſing the Sentence of a particular Biſhop or Judge. And is not this an evident and inconteſtable Proof that the Power of receiving Appeals was not known, or thought of, in thoſe Days? And yet, who would believe it? *Bellarmine* has the Aſſurance to allege this very Caſe as an Argument to prove in the Pope a Power of receiving Appeals [w]. But what would become of this Prerogative, ſhould the Pope return the ſame Anſwer to every Appellant?

Marcion *comes to* Rome.

The Power of receiving Appeals diſowned by the Church of Rome.

Pius governed the Church for the Space of Fifteen Years, and died in 157. the Twentieth of *Antoninus* [x]. The *Roman* Martyrology tells us, that he was martyred in the Perſecution of *Antoninus Pius*; but in that Prince's Reign there was no Perſecution; nor is the Title of Martyr given him by *Irenæus*. *Baronius* aſcribes to this Pope a Decree, commanding the Feſtival of *Eaſter* to be kept on *Sunday*, and quotes the Chronicle of *Euſebius* [y]. This Decree is indeed men-

Pius *no Martyr.*

Writings aſcribed to him.

[t] Epiph. hær. 42. c. 1. [u] Idem ib. [w] Bell. l. 2. c. 21. [x] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 11. [y] Bar. ad ann. 159.

tioned in ſome Editions of that Writer; but *Scaliger* aſſures us, that no Mention is made of it in any Manuſcript Copy; and therefore he has left it out in his Edition [z]. As to the Celebration of *Eaſter*, it is manifeſt from *Irenæus*, that though *Pius*, as well as his Predeceſſors *Sixtus*, *Teleſphorus*, and *Hyginus*, differed from the Biſhops of *Aſia*, yet they did not on that Account ſeparate themſelves from their Communion [a]. On this Pope are fathered ſeveral ſpurious Pieces, *viz.* ſome Decrees, Two Letters ranked among the Decretals, and Two more written to *Juſtus* Biſhop of *Vienne* in *Dauphiné*. The Decrees, as well as the Decretals, are univerſally rejected; and yet *F. Pagi* quotes one of them to prove the real Preſence in the Sacrament [b]. The two Letters to *Juſtus* are deemed genuine by *Baronius* [c], by Cardinal *Bona* [d], and by *Blondel* in his Treatiſe of the Sibyls [e], who nevertheleſs ſuſpects them elſewhere [f]. On the other hand, they are abſolutely rejected as falſe by Dr. *Pearſon* [g], by *Cotelerius* [h], and *Natalis Alexander* [i], who diſcover ſeveral Expreſſions in them that were not in Uſe till ſome Ages after, and a great many Incoherences. To ſay with *Le Sueur*, That they were written originally in *Greek*, and in latter Times tranſlated into *Latin* [k], is but a poor Evaſion. As for the Fable of *Hermes*, the Brother of *Pius*, who, by the Command of an Angel appearing to him in the Diſguiſe of a Shepherd, is ſaid to have wrote a Book ſhewing that *Eaſter* ought to be kept on *Sunday*, I refer the Reader to *Platina*, and ſuch-like Writers.

ANTONINUS, **ANICETUS,** M. AURELIUS.

Tenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 157. *St.* Polycarp *comes to* Rome, *and reclaims many from the Errors of* Marcion.

PIUS was ſucceeded by *Anicetus*, in whoſe Time *Valentine* the Heretic, who came to *Rome* in the Pontificate of *Hyginus*, and had gained many Proſelytes under *Pius*, continued ſowing his peſtilential Errors among the Members of that Church: but many whom he had ſeduced, were reclaimed by St. *Polycarp*, formerly the Diſciple of St. *John* the Evangeliſt, and then Biſhop of *Smyrna*. His declaring to

[z] Euſeb. chron. not. Scal. p. 119. [a] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 24. [b] Pagi in Pio, n. 2. [c] Bar. ad ann. 166. [d] Bona rer. liturgic. l. 1. c. 3. [e] Blond. l. 2. c. 6. [f] Idem de la primauté. [g] Pearſ. in Ign. l. 2. p. 170. [h] Cotel. not. in ſcript. Apoſt. p. 42, 43. [i] Nat. Alex. t. 1. p. 89. [k] Sueur. hiſt. de l'Egl. &c. ad ann. 149.

them, that the Doctrine taught by the Church was the Doctrine he had learnt of the Apoſtles, made ſuch an Impreſſion on their Minds, that they abjured the Errors of *Valentine*, and returned to the Communion of the Faithful [l]. They preferred the bare Word of *Polycarp*, who claimed no Infallibility, to the infallible Authority of *Hyginus*, *Pius*, and *Anicetus*. This is a plain Proof, that the Popes had not yet begun to exert their Infallibility; or, if they had, that it was not acknowleged. What brought St. *Polycarp* to *Rome* was the Controverſy about the Celebration of *Eaſter*, which at this Time began to grow very warm between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches [m]. All the Churches of the Eaſt, and amongſt the reſt that of *Smyrna*, kept *Eaſter* on the 14th Day of the Moon of the firſt Month, in Conformity to the Cuſtom of the *Jews*: on the other hand, *Anicetus* would neither conform to that Cuſtom himſelf, nor ſuffer any under his Juriſdiction to conform to it, obliging them to celebrate that Solemnity on the *Sunday* next following the 14th of the Moon. That this Diſpute might not occaſion a Schiſm in the Church, *Polycarp* undertook a Journey to *Rome*, in order to confer with the Biſhop of that City, who was the chief Oppoſer of the *Quartodecimans* [n]. But it happened in this, as it does in moſt religious Diſputes, they parted, each retaining his own Way of thinking; but at the ſame time, what happens but ſeldom, without the leaſt Breach of that Charity which is the great and fundamental Law of our holy Religion. In Token whereof they communicated together at the holy Sacrament; nay, *Anicetus*, out of Reſpect to St. *Polycarp*, yielded to him the *Euchariſt* [o]; that is, gave him leave to conſecrate the *Euchariſt* in his own Church: after which they parted in Peace, though both determined to follow the antient Practice of their reſpective Churches [p]. St. *Polycarp*, though well acquainted with the Doctrine of the Apoſtles, was a Stranger, it ſeems, to that of *Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, &c. *viz.* that the whole Catholic Church is bound to conform to the Rites, Ceremonies, and Cuſtoms of the Church of *Rome*.

Anicetus *and he diſagree about the Celebration of* Eaſter, *but part without Breach of Charity.*

In the Time of *Anicetus*, *Hegeſippus*, and the celebrated Martyr St. *Juſtin*, came to *Rome*, upon what Occaſion is uncertain. The former, continuing there to the Pontificate of *Eleutherius*, wrote a Book on the Doctrine which in that Church had been conveyed down from the Apoſtles to *Anicetus*, and was ſtill obſerved, ſays he, in all its

Hegeſippus *and St.* Juſtin *at* Rome.

[l] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. & l. 1. c. 24. [m] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 13. [n] Iren. apud Euſeb. l. iv. c. 14. [o] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 23, 24. [p] Idem ib.

original Purity [q]. The latter oppoſed with great Zeal *Marcion*, and his Followers, publiſhing a Book againſt his pernicious Tenets, and againſt Hereſies in general [r]. It was at *Rome* that he had frequent Conferences with *Creſcens* the *Cynic*, a Man of ſome Note at that Time; but, according to the Genius of his Sect, proud, ſurly, conceited, and a declared Enemy to all who profeſſed the Chriſtian Religion, which he painted in the blackeſt Colours [s]. The Malice of this *Cynic* procured in the End for our zealous and learned Apologiſt what he had long and moſt ardently wiſhed, the Glory of ſealing with his Blood the Truth, which he had ſo ſtrenuouſly defended and promoted with his Pen [t]. He ſuffered under *Marcus Aurelius* and *L. Verus* about the Year 167. towards the End of the Pontificate of *Anicetus*.

To this Pope are aſcribed by *Anaſtaſius*, *Platina*, *Ciaconius*, and other modern Writers, ſeveral Ordinances and Decrees; but as they are not mentioned by any of the Antients, we do not think them worthy of our Notice. *Anicetus* governed the Church, according to *Euſebius* [u], Eleven Years, from the Year 157. to the 8th Year of *M. Aurelius*, that is, to 168. of the Chriſtian Æra. *Raban*, *Florus*, and *Anaſtaſius*, ſuppoſe him to have died for the Profeſſion of the Faith; which was, it ſeems, unknown to *Irenæus*. He was buried, according to ſome, near St. *Peter*, in the *Vatican*, according to others, in the Burying-place of *Calixtus* [w]; out of which, though it is uncertain whether he was buried there or no, his Head was taken in 1590. and given by *Urban* VII. to the *Jeſuits* of *Munich* in *Bavaria*, where it is yearly, with great Solemnity, expoſed to public Adoration on the 17th of *April*, the Anniverſary, as is ſuppoſed, of his Death: his Body was taken out of the ſame Place in 1604. and given by *Clement* VIII. to the Duke of *Altaemps*, who cauſed it to be conveyed to the Chapel of his Palace in *Rome*, and to be depoſited there in a Marble Tomb, formerly the Tomb of the Emperor *Alexander*; where it is worſhiped to this Day.

Anicetus *not a Martyr.*

His Reliques.

[q] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 11. [r] Juſt. Apol. 2. p. 70. [s] Tatian. orat. cont. Græc. p. 160. [t] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 16. Epiph. hær. 46. c. 1. [u] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 19. [w] Vide Bolland. April. 17, & 22.

SOTER,

M. AURELIUS.

SOTER,

Eleventh BISHOP *of* Rome,

SOTER, the Succeſſor of *Anicetus*, is highly commended on account of his extenſive Charity towards the Poor of other Churches, but more eſpecially towards thoſe who were condemned for the Confeſſion of their Faith to work in the Mines [x]. Theſe he is ſaid not only to have relieved in their Diſtreſs with generous Gatherings made for that Purpoſe at *Rome*, wherein he followed the Example of his Predeceſſors, but moreover to have ſent Letters to them in their afflicted Condition. This we learn from a Letter of *Dionyſius*, then Biſhop of *Corinth*, which was an Anſwer to a Letter from *Soter*, and the Church of *Rome*. *Dionyſius* returns Thanks to the *Romans*, and their Biſhop, for their Generoſity to the Poor of *Corinth*; acquaints *Soter* that his Letter had been publickly read; adds, that he ſhall cauſe it to be read for the future; and cloſes his Epiſtle with great Encomiums on the *Romans*, who had ſo generouſly contributed to the Support of the indigent *Corinthians* [y]. This laudable Cuſtom did not end with the Second Century of the Church; for *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, writing about the Year 254. to *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome*, ſays, that all *Syria* and *Arabia* felt the good Effects of the Generoſity of the *Romans* [z]. And ſome Years after, that is about the Year 260. Pope *Dionyſius* being informed that the City of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia* had been ruined by the Wars, and many Chriſtians carried into Captivity, he ſent large Sums to ranſom them, with a Letter to the Church of *Cæſarea*, which was ſtill read in St. *Baſil*'s Time [a]. *Euſebius* tells us, that this Cuſtom continued till the laſt Perſecution [b]. How differently the immenſe Revenues of the See of *Rome* are employed now, thoſe know who have ſeen the extravagant Pomp, Luxury, and Parade of that Court. In the Year 171. the Fourth of *Soter*, was broached the Hereſy of the *Montaniſts*, ſo called from their Ringleader *Montanus* [c]. Againſt theſe *Soter* is ſaid, by an anonymous Writer of ſome Antiquity, to have compoſed a Book, which was anſwered, according to the ſame Writer, by *Tertullian*, become

Year of Chriſt 168.

His Charities to the diſtreſſed Chriſtians.

The Hereſy of Montanus *broached in his Time.*

[x] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 23.
[y] Idem ib.
[z] Idem, l. 7. c. 5.
[a] Baſil. ep. 220.
[b] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 23.
[c] Euſeb. chron.

the

the Defender of that Sect [g]: but, according to the beſt Chronologiſts, *Tertullian* did not turn *Montaniſt* till many Years after the Death of *Soter*; and, beſides, both *Soter's* Book, and *Tertullian's* Anſwer to it, were quite unknown to *Euſebius*, and even to St. *Jerom*, who took great Delight in reading *Tertullian*. *Soter* preſided Eight Years, according to *Euſebius* [h]; that is, from the Year 168. to 176. or to the Beginning of 177. the 17th Year of the Reign of *M. Aurelius*. The Title of Martyr is given him by the modern Writers, but not by *Irenæus*, or any of the Antients. To him are falſly aſcribed Two Epiſtles, which have been placed among the Decretals. Where he was buried is uncertain; but his Body is worſhiped, at preſent, in the Church of St. *Sylveſter* at *Rome, and in the Cathedral of* Toledo *in* Spain [i].

He did not die a Martyr.

M. AURELIUS, **ELEUTHERIUS**, COMMODUS.

Twelfth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 176.

ELEUTHERIUS was Deacon of the Church of *Rome* in 168. when *Hegeſippus* came to that City [a]; but *Soter*, the Succeſſor of *Anicetus*, being dead, he was choſen to govern the Church in his room [b]. It is certain, that his Election was known in *Gaul* before the Death of the Martyrs of *Lions*, ſo famous in eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; for the Controverſy, which had been raiſed ſome Years before in the Churches of *Aſia*, by *Montanus* and his Followers, concerning the prophetic Spirit, to which they pretended, making at that time a great Noiſe in the Church, the Martyrs of *Lions*, deſirous to contribute, ſo far as in them lay, to the public Peace, wrote Letters, from their Priſons, to the Churches of *Aſia*, and likewiſe to *Eleutherius*, Biſhop of *Rome*, declaring their Judgment and Opinion in the Caſe [c]: for great Honour was paid, in thoſe Times, to the Martyrs, and their Opinion was always received with Eſteem and Veneration. It were much to be wiſhed, that *Euſebius* had ſet down their Opinion at Length; but he contents himſelf only with ſaying, that it was entirely agreeable to true Piety, and to the orthodox

The Martyrs of Lions *write to* Eleutherius.

[g] Auct. anonym. de hæreſ. a Sirmund. edit. hær. 26. 86. p. 28. 79. [h] Euſeb. l. 5. p. 153. [i] Bar. in martyrol. 22 April. et Bollard. ad eund. diem. [a] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 22. Hier. vir. ill. c. 22. [b] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. [c] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 3.

Faith;

Faith [d]; which, in my Opinion, is enough to make us reject the Notion of Dr. *Pearſon*, who takes it for granted, that they wrote in Favour of thoſe Fanatics, and that for no other Reaſon but becauſe they are ſaid, by *Euſebius*, to have wrote for the Peace of the Church [e]. Was the admitting of falſe Prophets, and falſe Prophecies, giving Peace to the Church? The ſame Writer adds, that *Eleutherius* was induced, by the Reverence and Regard he had for the holy Martyrs, to receive the Prophecies of *Montanus*, and his Two Prophetеſſes [f]. But herein I muſt beg Leave to diſagree with that learned Writer, and likewiſe with Dr. *Cave* [g]; for it was not, in my Opinion, *Eleutherius*, but his Succeſſor *Victor*, who received the Prophecies of *Montanus*. *Tertullian*, the only Author who informs us, that the Dreams of that Enthuſiaſt were approved by the Biſhop of *Rome*, does not diſtinguiſh that Biſhop by his Name; ſo that he is to be found out only by Reaſoning and Chronology. Now, on one hand, we read in *Tertullian*, that *Montanus* had been oppoſed by *the Predeceſſors* of the Biſhop, who embraced his Opinions [h]; and, on the other, in *Euſebius* [i], that the Hereſy of *Montanus* was firſt broached in the Year 171. the Eleventh of the Reign of *M. Aurelius*, and the Fourth of the Pontificate of *Soter*, the immediate Predeceſſor of *Eleutherius*; theſe Two therefore, and theſe alone, were the Biſhops, who could oppoſe *Montanus*; and, ſince the firſt Broaching of that Hereſy, the only Predeceſſors of the Biſhop who embraced it. *Victor*, the Succeſſor of *Eleutherius*, was greatly provoked againſt the *Aſiatic* Biſhops, on account of their refuſing to comply with the Cuſtom of the Church of *Rome*, in the Celebration of *Eaſter*; and therefore might, out of Spite to them, approve of the Opinions which they had condemned: for *Montanus*, and his Followers, had been already condemned, as *Euſebius* informs us [k], by ſeveral Synods held in *Aſia Minor*. No Opinion is now deemed heretical, unleſs condemned by the Biſhop of *Rome*, who claims that Prerogative as peculiar to himſelf; but the Synods of *Aſia*, the firſt mentioned in Hiſtory, after that of the Apoſtles at *Jeruſalem*, condemned the Opinions of *Montanus*, and cut him off from their Communion, without conſulting, or even acquainting therewith, the Biſhop of *Rome*. But, to return to the Martyrs; ſome are of Opinion, that they condemned, in their

Eleutherius did not approve the Prophecies of Montanus.

Councils held without conſulting the Biſhop of Rome.

[d] Euſeb. ib. [e] Pearſ. poſt. p. 255. [f] Idem ib. [g] Cave Lives of the Fathers, p. 164. [h] Tert. in Prax. c. 1. [i] Euſeb. in chron. [k] Idem, l. 5. c. 16. Conc. per Labb. t. 1. p. 599.

Letters,

Letters, the Tenets of *Montanus*, and his Followers; but, at the ſame time, wrote in their Favour, ſo far as to intreat the Biſhops of *Aſia*, and *Eleutherius* Biſhop of *Rome*, to treat them with Indulgence, and admit them, upon Repentance, to their Communion [l]. This is but a bare Conjecture, not authorized by any of the Antients; and we don't find, that the *Montaniſts* ever ſhewed the leaſt Inclination to return to the Communion of the Church.

Florinus *and* Blaſtus *broach their new Doctrine.*

It was in the Pontificate of *Eleutherius*, that *Florinus* and *Blaſtus* firſt broached their new Doctrine; which was readily embraced by many at *Rome*; for they were both Presbyters of that Church [m]. *Florinus* was firſt one of the Emperor's Officers in *Aſia*, afterwards the Diſciple of St. *Polycarp*, then famous all over that Province; and, laſtly, Presbyter of the Church of *Rome*; but both he and *Blaſtus* were degraded on account of their heretical Opinions, and cut off from the Communion of the Faithful [n]. Againſt *Florinus*, *Irenæus*, then Biſhop of *Lions*, wrote a Letter, intituled, *Of Monarchy, or that God is not the Author of Evil* [o]; and another Piece called, *De Ogdoede*, that is, *of the Eight*; meaning, perhaps, the Eight *Eons*, or Perſons that compoſed the chimerical Divinity of the *Valentinians*; for *Florinus* fell at laſt into that Hereſy [p]. Againſt *Blaſtus*, whom *Pacian* ſurnames the *Greek* [q], *Irenæus* wrote a Book, intituled, *Of Schiſm* [r]. *Ado* [s] and *Bede* [t] tell us, that *Eleutherius* iſſued a Decree, ordaining *Eaſter* to be kept on the *Sunday* after the 14th of the firſt Moon; but as no mention is made of ſuch a Decree, by any Writer of thoſe Times, their Authority is of no Weight.

The Converſion of Lucius, *a* Britiſh *King.*

Lucius, a *Britiſh* King, is ſaid, by *Bede*, to have wrote to Pope *Eleutherius*, intreating him to ſend a proper Perſon into *Britain*, to inſtruct him in the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion; which the Pope readily granted [u]. But as this is vouched only by *Bede*, who lived many Ages after him, and by a Pontifical, ſuppoſed to have been written about the Middle of the Sixth Century, what Credit the whole Hiſtory of *Lucius* may deſerve, I leave the Reader to judge. Such a remarkable Event could not have eſcaped *Euſebius*, who, ſpeaking of this very Period of Time, tells us, that, at *Rome*, many Perſons, eminent for their Birth and Wealth, embraced the Chriſtian

[l] Vide Dupin. Biblioth. p. 287. [m] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 14. [n] Idem ib. c. 15. 20. [o] Idem ib. [p] Fleuri. hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 3. c. 26, 27. p. 395, 397. [q] Pacian. ep. 1. [r] Euſeb. ib. c. 20. [s] Ado ad ann. 194. [t] Bed. chron. t. 2. p. 111. [u] Bed. hiſt. l. 1. c. 4. et chron. t. 2. p. 111.

Religion,

Religion, with their whole Families [w]. A ſolemn Embaſſy from a *Britiſh* King, and his Converſion, ſurely deſerved a Place in the Hiſtory of the Church. He informs us, that, in the Reign of *Commodus*, and the Pontificate of *Eleutherius*, the Chriſtian Religion enjoyed a profound Tranquillity all over the World; that it flouriſhed, and attracted, to uſe his Expreſſion, the Minds of many People [x]. Had he not here a favourable Opportunity of mentioning our Royal Proſelyte, who, in the Reign of *Commodus*, is ſuppoſed to have wrote to *Eleutherius*, and by his means to have been converted to the Chriſtian Religion? To what can we aſcribe the Silence of ſuch an exact and accurate Writer, concerning an Event which would have greatly recommended both his Hiſtory, and the Chriſtian Religion? To an invincible Antipathy, ſays the Jeſuit *Alford* [y], which he bore to the Name of *Britain*, and which was ſo prevalent in him, that he choſe rather to ſuppreſs the Converſion of *Lucius* than mention it. But what could thus ſet *Euſebius* againſt *Britain*? Had he been ever injured by the *Britons*? Does he not elſewhere mention both them and their Country? This jeſuitical, abſurd, and groundleſs Speculation, which muſt expoſe the Author of it to the Ridicule of every Reader, I ſhould perhaps have let paſs unobſerved, had he not in this very Place inſulted, beyond the Bounds of common Decency, the Reformers of Religion, for rejecting ſome idle Ceremonies, which he ſuppoſes to have been practiſed at the Converſion of *Lucius*. But, not to lay the whole Streſs on the Silence of *Euſebius*, and other antient Writers, to whom King *Lucius* was utterly unknown, why ſhould he have been at the Trouble of ſending to *Rome* for an Inſtructor? Were there not many in his own Kingdom as capable of inſtructing him as any *Rome* could ſend? The Chriſtian Religion had been planted in this Iſland long before the Reign of *Lucius*, in the Time of the Apoſtles, as *Gildas* ſeems to inſinuate [z], at leaſt very early in the Second Century; for *Origen*, who flouriſhed in the Beginning of the Third, tells us, that the Virtue of the Name of *Jeſus* had paſſed the Seas, to find out the *Britons* in another World [a].

The whole Account fabulous.

The ſhort Account, which *Bede* gives us of the Embaſſy and Converſion of King *Lucius*, has not only been greedily ſwallowed by the monkiſh Writers, who came after him, but has ſerved as a Ground-plot to the innumerable Fables with which they have filled this Part

Several monkiſh Fables concerning King Lucius.

[w] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 21. [x] Idem ib. [y] Annal. ad ann. 182. p. 140. [z] Gild. ex. c. 6. p. 116. [a] Orig. in Luc. hom. 6.

of their Hiſtories. They even tell us the Names of the Embaſſadors ſent by *Lucius* to the Pope, and of the Legates *a Latere* ſent by the Pope to *Lucius*. The former were *Elvanus* and *Medwinus*, who, being ordained Biſhops by *Eleutherius*, returned to *Britain*, and greatly contributed to the Converſion of this Iſland. Theſe Fables gained Credit, by Degrees, in thoſe Ages of Ignorance and Superſtition, inſomuch that the Two Embaſſadors were, at laſt, ranked among the Saints; and their Bodies, where or when found, nobody knows, expoſed to public Veneration, in the Monaſtery of *Glaſſenbury*, on the Firſt of *January* [b]. The Pope's Legates were *Fugacius* and *Damianus*, who, as we are told, went back to *Rome*, to obtain of *Eleutherius* a Confirmation of what they had done; and, from *Rome*, returned into *Britain*, with a Letter from the Pope to King *Lucius* [c]. As for the King himſelf, he is ſaid to have quitted his Kingdom, and, turning Miſſionary, to have preached the Goſpel in *Germany*, eſpecially at *Ausburg*; to have travelled from thence into the Country of the *Griſons*; and, laſtly, to have been ordained Biſhop of *Coire*, their Metropolis; and to have died there a Martyr [d]. To theſe monkiſh Fables King *Lucius* owes a Place among the Saints; for on the Third of *December* is kept, in the Church of *Rome*, *the Feſtival of* Lucius, *King of the* Britons, *who died at* Coire *in* Germany [e]: theſe are the Words of the *Roman* Martyrology; but *Bede* does not ſo much as mention him in his; a plain Proof, that what is ſaid of his Preaching, of his Martyrdom, *&c.* was invented after that Writer's Time. And yet *Alford* has not only filled his Annals with theſe, and ſuch-like fabulous Accounts, giving an intire Credit to them, but inveighs, with great Acrimony, againſt thoſe who have not the Gift of Belief in the ſame Degree with himſelf, eſpecially againſt *Dempſter*, telling him, that till his Time the Converſion of *Lucius* had never been queſtioned by any Man of Senſe or Learning [f]. And truly, the Story of King *Lucius* has been credited even by the greater Part of Proteſtant Writers, out of Reſpect to our venerable Hiſtorian; but as he wrote many Ages after the pretended Converſion of that Prince, and none of the Writers of thoſe Days, whom ſuch a remarkable Event could hardly have eſcaped, give us the leaſt Hint of it, we may be well allowed to queſtion the Whole, notwithſtanding the Authority

[b] Vide Uſh. Brit. eccleſ. antiq. c. 4. et Bolland 1. Jan. [c] Bar. ad ann. 183. Bolland 26 Maii. Uſh. ib. p. 54. 102. [d] Vide Uſh. ib. p. 137, 138. [e] Martyr. Rom. 3 Decem. [f] Alf. ad ann. 201. p. 201.

of

of *Bede*, which can be of no Weight with reſpect to Tranſactions that are ſaid to have happened in Times ſo remote.

Eleutherius governed, according to the beſt Chronologers, Fifteen Years; and died in 192. the laſt of the Emperor *Commodus* [g]. To him are aſcribed a Decretal, addreſſed to the Biſhops of *Gaul*, and a Decree, declaring againſt *Montanus*, and his Followers, that no Food was forbidden to the Chriſtians; but both are deemed ſpurious. He was buried, according to ſome, in the *Salarian* Way, according to others, in the *Vatican*; but, in what Place ſoever he was buried, his Body is now worſhiped in the *Vatican* at *Rome*, in the Cathedral of *Troia* in *Apulia*, and in ſeveral other Places [h]. The Title of Martyr is given him by the Church of *Rome*, but not by any of the antient Writers. Under him flouriſhed *Hegeſippus*, who wrote, in Five Books, an Account of what had happened in the Church ſince our Saviour's Death, to his Time [i]. He came to *Rome* in the Pontificate of *Anicetus*, who was choſen in 157. and, remaining there to the Time of *Eleutherius*, who ſucceeded *Anicetus* and *Soter* in 177. he wrote a Book on the Doctrine received by Tradition in that Church [k]; but neither of theſe Works has reached our Times.

COMMODUS, PERTINAX,

VICTOR,

SEVERUS.

Thirteenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

VICTOR, the Succeſſor of *Eleutherius*, is counted by a Writer, who, at this very Time, lived in *Rome*, the Thirteenth Biſhop of that City [l]: ſo that neither is St. *Peter* reckoned among them, nor is *Cletus* diſtinguiſhed from *Anacletus*. In *Victor*'s Time a new Hereſy was broached, at *Rome*, by one *Theodotus* of *Byzantium*, denying the Divinity of *Chriſt* [m]. The *Theodotians* gave out, that *Victor* favoured their Doctrine [n]; which he did, perhaps, at that Time [o]; though he cut them off afterwards from his Communion. Be that as it will, he can by no means be cleared from another Imputation, namely, that of owning and approving the prophetic Spirit of *Montanus*, and his Two Propheteſſes, *Priſca* and *Maximilla*: for *Tertullian*,

Year of Chriſt 192.

The Hereſy of Theodotus.

Victor *approves the prophetic Spirit of* Montanus.

g Euſeb. chron. Florent. p. 811. h Bolland. 26 Maii, p. 364. i Hier. vir. ill. c. 22. k Idem ib. et Euſeb. l. 4. c. 11, 22. l Vide Euſeb. l. 5. c. 28. m Epiph. hær. 54. c. 1. Euſeb. l. 5. c. 28. n Euſeb. ib. o Idem ib.

tullian, his Cotemporary, tells us, in expreſs Terms, that he received their Prophecies; that, upon receiving them, he gave Letters of Peace to the Churches of *Aſia* and *Phrygia*; but that one *Praxeas*, juſt come from thoſe Parts, giving him a falſe Account of thoſe Prophets, and their Churches, and remonſtrating that, by approving them, he condemned his Predeceſſors, prevailed upon him to revoke the Letters, which he had already wrote in their Behalf. Thus *Tertullian*, become himſelf a Follower of *Montanus* [p]. Here *Baronius* and *Bellarmine*, the Two great Advocates for the Pope's Infallibility, are put to a Stand: they own, and cannot help owning, that the Pope was deceived, and impoſed upon; but, for all that, will not give up his Infallibility. How great is the Power of Prejudice and Prepoſſeſſion! They find the Pope actually erring, and yet maintain, that he cannot err. But this Apoſtaſy from common Senſe, if I may be allowed the Expreſſion, is not, perhaps, ſo much owing to Prejudice, as to ſomething worſe; for no Prejudice, however prevalent, can withſtand the indiſputable Evidence of plain Matters of Fact. It is no new thing, ſays *Baronius*, nor what ought to cauſe in us the leaſt Surprize, that a Pope ſhould be over-reached by Impoſtors [q]. A Pope over-reached in Matters of Faith! What then becomes of Infallibility? or what is the Uſe of it? But the *Montaniſts*, ſays *Bellarmine* [r], craftily concealed from the Pope what was erroneous and heretical in their Prophecies; ſo that he, diſcovering nothing in their Doctrine repugnant to that of the Church, believed they had been unjuſtly accuſed to, and condemned by, his Predeceſſors. But, in the firſt Place, *Tertullian* tells us, in expreſs Terms, that the Prophecies of *Montanus*, and his Followers, were approved by the Pope; whereas the Prophecies, which he is ſuppoſed by *Bellarmine* to have approved, were not the Prophecies of *Montanus*, but others, quite different, and in every reſpect orthodox. In the ſecond Place, if *Victor* believed, that the *Montaniſts* had been unjuſtly condemned by his Predeceſſors, he did not believe them infallible; ſo that, in every Light, this Fact overſets the pretended Infallibility. We may add, that, if the Pope's Infallibility depends upon a right Information, and neither he nor we can know whether he has been rightly informed, his Infallibility is thereby rendered quite uſeleſs; ſince, in every particular Caſe, we may

His Infallibility, *how defended by* Baronius *and* Bellarmine.

[p] Tert. in Prax. c. 1. [q] Bar. ad. ann. 173. n. 4. [r] Bell. de ſum. Pont. l. 4. c. 8.

doubt,

doubt, and that Doubt cannot be removed, whether the Information, upon which he acts, was right, or no.

But what moſt of all diſtinguiſhed the Pontificate of *Victor* was, the famous Controverſy about the Celebration of *Eaſter*, between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops; the former keeping that Solemnity on the 14th Day of the firſt Moon, on what Day ſoever of the Week it happened to fall; and the latter putting it off till the *Sunday* following. This, ſurely, could not be a Point of any Conſequence, ſince the Apoſtles had not thought fit to ſettle any thing concerning it; nay, by obſerving the Paſchal Solemnity themſelves, ſome on the one Day, and ſome on the other, as it is manifeſt they did [s], they plainly declared, that it was quite indifferent on what Day it was obſerved. Accordingly, from the Apoſtles Time to *Victor's*, each Church had followed the Cuſtom and Practice eſtabliſhed by their reſpective Founders, without giving the leaſt Diſturbance to others, or being, on that Account, diſturbed by them [t]. Pope *Anicetus* even ſuffered ſuch of the *Aſiatics* as happened to be at *Rome*, to celebrate *Eaſter* after the manner of *Aſia* [u]: *Soter*, indeed, and his Succeſſor *Eleutherius*, obliged thoſe who lived at *Rome* to conform to the Cuſtom of that Church; but that did not prevent their ſending the *Euchariſt*, or Sacrament, to the Biſhops, who followed the oppoſite Practice [w]; for a Cuſtom then obtained among Biſhops to ſend the *Euchariſt* to each other, eſpecially at *Eaſter*, in Token of Communion and Peace; but this Cuſtom was ſuppreſſed by the 14th Canon of the Council held, in the Fourth Century, at *Laodicea* [x]. *Victor*, not ſatisfied with what his Two immediate Predeceſſors had done, took upon him to impoſe the *Roman* Cuſtom on all the Churches that followed the contrary Practice. But, in this bold Attempt, which we may call the firſt Eſſay of Papal Uſurpation, he met with a vigorous and truly Chriſtian Oppoſition from *Polycrates*, at that Time Biſhop of *Epheſus*, and one of the moſt eminent Men in the Church, both for Piety and Learning. He had ſtudied, ſays *Euſebius* [y], the Scriptures with great Attention, had conferred with Chriſtians from all Parts of the World, and had ever conformed his Life to the Rules of the Goſpel. *Jerom* ſpeaks of him as a Man of excellent Parts, and one univerſally reſpected [z]. In the preſent Controverſy, he peremptorily refuſed

The famous Controverſy about the Celebration of Eaſter.

Victor's *haughty Conduct.*

Is oppoſed by the Biſhop of Epheſus,

[s] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 23, 25. Socrat. l. 5. c. 21. Epiph. hær. 70. c. 10. [t] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 24. [u] Idem ib. [w] Idem ib. c. 20. [x] Concil. per Labb. t. 1. p. 150. [y] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 22. et 24. [z] Hier. vir. ill. c. 45.

to

to relinquish the Practice of his own Church, which had been first introduced by the Apostles St. *John* and St. *Philip*, and had been handed down to him by Seven Bishops of his own Family [a]. Hereupon *Victor*, impatient of Contradiction, wrote a Letter, threatening to cut him off from his Communion, unless he forthwith complied with the Practice of the Church of *Rome* [b]. *Polycrates*, greatly surprised at the hasty Proceedings of his Fellow-Bishop, assembled, in *Ephesus*, a Council of all the Bishops of *Asia minor*, when it was unanimously resolved, that the Practice, which they had received from their Predecessors, ought not to be changed [c]. Agreeably to this Resolution, *Polycrates* wrote to *Victor*, acquainting him therewith; and, at the same time, modestly insinuating, that, as to his Menaces, he had better forbear them, since they had no manner of Effect upon him, or his Brethren [d]. Upon the Receipt of this Letter *Victor*, giving the Reins to an impotent and ungovernable Passion, published bitter Invectives against all the Churches of *Asia*, declared them cut off from his Communion, sent Letters of Excommunication to their respective Bishops; and, at the same time, in order to have them cut off from the Communion of the whole Church, wrote to the other Bishops, exhorting them to follow his Example, and forbear communicating with their refractory Brethren of *Asia* [e]. They all complied, to be sure, with the Desire of the Head of the Church, who had Power to command; but, out of his great Moderation, chose to exhort and advise! No; not one followed his Example, or Advice; not one paid any sort of Regard to his Letters, or shewed the least Inclination to second him in such a rash and uncharitable Attempt; but, on the contrary, they all joined, as *Eusebius* assures us [f], in sharply censuring and rebuking him, as a Disturber of the Peace of the Church. Among the rest *Irenæus*, then Bishop of *Lions*, wrote him an excellent Letter, putting him in mind of the Moderation of his Predecessors, and telling him, that though he agreed with him in the Main of the Controversy, yet he could not approve of his cutting off whole Churches, for the Observance of Customs, which they had received from their Ancestors. He wrote, at the same time, to many other Bishops [g], no doubt, to dissuade them from joining the Bishop of *Rome*. However that be, it is certain, that, by this means, the

and by a Council of all the Bishops of Asia minor.

He cuts them off from his Communion.

No Regard had to his Excommunication.

He is censured by Irenæus.

[a] Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. [b] Idem ib. [c] Idem ib. [d] Idem ib. Hier. vir. ill. c. 45. [e] Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. Socrat. l. 5. c. 22. [f] Euseb. ib. [g] Euseb. ib. et Socrat. l. 5. c. 22.

Storm

Storm was laid, a Calm was reſtored to the Church, and the *Aſiatics* allowed to follow undiſturbed their antient Practice [h]. But Pope *Victor*, ſays *Baronius* [i], excommunicated the *Aſiatics*, which he would never have ventured to do, had he not known, that he had Power and Juriſdiction over them. The Argument may be thus retorted againſt him: The *Aſiatics* made no Account of his Excommunication; which they would not have ventured to do, had they not known, that he had no Power nor Juriſdiction over them. Beſides, *Victor* did not excommunicate them, as that Word is now underſtood; that is, he did not cut them off from the Communion of the Catholic Church; for all the other Biſhops continued to communicate with them, as they had done before; he only ſeparated himſelf from their Communion, which was no more than every Biſhop had Power to do. *Victor* being thus baffled in his Attempt, his Succeſſors took care not to revive the Controverſy; ſo that the *Aſiatics* peaceably followed their antient Practice till the Council of *Nice*, which, out of Complaiſance to *Conſtantine the Great*, ordered the Solemnity of *Eaſter* to be kept every-where on the ſame Day, after the Cuſtom of *Rome* [k].

Had no Power over the Aſiatics.

This Diſpute happened, not in the Reign of *Commodus*, as we read in the *Synodicon* [l], but, in the Fourth Year of the Reign of *Severus*, as St. *Jerom* informs us [m], of Chriſt 196. *Victor*, of whom we find nothing elſe in the Antients worthy of notice, died Five Years after [n], that is, in the Ninth of the Emperor *Severus*, and in the End of 201. or the Beginning of 202. of Chriſt, having governed the Church Ten Years. He is named, by St. *Jerom*, the firſt among the Eccleſiaſtical Authors that wrote in *Latin* [o]. He publiſhed a Piece, on the Controverſy about the Celebration of *Eaſter*, and ſome other Books on religious Subjects, which were ſtill extant in St. *Jerom*'s Time [p]. As for the Two Decretals that are aſcribed to him, and the Two Letters to *Deſiderius* and *Paracoda*, both Biſhops of *Vienne*, they are univerſally rejected [q]. The Church of *Rome* has placed *Victor* among her Saints; and truly, his Attempt, however unſucceſsful, to promote the Power, and extend the Juriſdiction, of that See, deſerved no leſs a Reward.

Victor *dies.*

His Works.

Pieces falſly aſcribed to him.

He is ſainted.

[h] Euſeb. ib. Hier. vir. ill. c. 35. Phot. c. 120. Cypr. ep. 75. Anat. p. 445. [i] Bar. ad ann. 198. n. 10. [k] Euſeb. vit. Conſt. l. 3. c. 18. Soz. l. 1. c. 16. Concil. l. 3. c. 18, 19. p. 492. [l] Concil. Labb. t. 1. p. 601. [m] Hier. vir. ill. c. 43. et chron. [n] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 28. Hier. chron. [o] Hier. de vir. ill. c. 34, 40. [p] Idem ib. [q] Pearſ. poſth. p. 91, 92. Boſquet. l. 3. c. 5.

ZEPHY-

SEVERUS, CARACALLA, GETA,

ZEPHYRINUS,

MACRINUS, DIADUMENUS, HELIOGABALUS.

Fourteenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 201.

A dreadful Perſecution againſt the Chriſtians.

IN the firſt Year of the Pontificate of *Zephyrinus*, who ſucceeded *Victor*, a dreadful Perſecution was raiſed againſt the Chriſtians by the Emperor *Severus*, and carried on with great Cruelty in all Parts of the Empire. *Zephyrinus*, however, had the good Luck to eſcape it, and to ſee the Church, by the Death of that Prince, happily delivered from the Evils, which the Rage of her foreign Enemies had brought upon her. But her domeſtic Enemies gave her no Reſpite; the *Theodotian* Heretics continued ſowing, and not without Succeſs, their peſtilential Errors at *Rome*. *Zephyrinus*, it ſeems, oppoſed them with great Vigour and Zeal; for they reproached him, as we read in *Euſebius*[a], as the firſt who had betrayed the Truth, by maintaining againſt them the Divinity of *Chriſt:* hence he is ranked, by *Optatus*, with *Tertullian*, *Victorinus*, &c. among thoſe who have ſucceſsfully defended the Catholic Church [b]. *Baronius*, to extol *Zephyrinus*, aſcribes to him the firſt Condemnation of *Praxeas* [c], which was followed by a ſolemn Retractation, under his own Hand. But it was in *Africa*, and not at *Rome*, that *Praxeas* was condemned, as appeared plain to me, from the Words of *Tertullian* [d], before I had ſeen either *Pamelius* or *Moreau*, who underſtand them in that Senſe. *Praxeas*, as we have obſerved above, had done an eminent Piece of Service to the Church of *Rome*, by reclaiming Pope *Victor* from the Hereſy of *Montanus:* but the Good he had done on that Occaſion was over-balanced by the Miſchief his new Hereſy occaſioned both at *Rome* and in *Africa*; for in both Places he gained many Proſelytes. He denied all Diſtinction of Perſons in the Godhead, ſo that the Father being, according to his Doctrine, the ſame Perſon with the Son, it was he who took upon him human Nature, and ſuffered on the Croſs; whence his Followers were called *Patropaſſians* [e].

Zephyrinus *oppoſes the* Theodotian *Heretics.*

The Hereſy of Praxeas.

In the Pontificate of *Zephyrinus*, and, as *Euſebius* ſeems to inſinuate, in the Beginning of the Reign of *Caracalla*, that is, towards the Year 211. or 212. came to *Rome* the celebrated *Origen*, being

Origen *at* Rome.

[a] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 28. [b] Opt. l. 1. c. 37. [c] Bar. ad ann. 196. n. 20. [d] Tert. in Prax. c. 1. p. 634. [e] Caten. Græc. Patr. c. 53.

deſirous

desirous, as he himself declared, to see that Church, so venerable for its Antiquity and Renown; but, after a very short Stay there, he returned to *Alexandria* [f]. About the same time happened, at *Rome*, the famous Dispute between *Caius*, a Presbyter of that Church, and *Proclus*, a leading Man among the *Montanists* [g]. *Caius* committed to Writing the Reasons and Arguments on both Sides [h]: but that Piece has not reached our Times, though it was well known to *Eusebius*, who styles it a Dialogue [i], and likewise to *Theodoret* [k].

Famous Dispute, at Rome, *between* Caius *and* Proclus.

It was during the Pontificate of *Zephyrinus* that *Tertullian*, the great Defender of the Christian Religion, fell off from the Catholic Church. His Fall, which was lamented by all the Faithful as a common Loss, is ascribed, by St. *Jerom*, to the Envy and ill Usage he met with from the *Roman* Clergy [l]. But how ill soever he was used by them in those Days, he has perhaps met with worse Treatment at their Hands in latter Times; for they call upon him as an Evidence, to witness the Pope's universal Jurisdiction, and to confirm to him the haughty Titles, which he assumes; but with how little Reason, will appear from the following Relation: A Catholic Bishop had, by a public Declaration, admitted Persons guilty of Adultery and Fornication to a Place among the Penitents. As *Tertullian* was a strict Observer of Rites and Discipline, and a most zealous Asserter of the greatest Rigours of Religion, he could not brook so much Moderation and Indulgence; and therefore, in his Book *De Pudicitia*, which he wrote on that Occasion, he extols the Severity of the antient Discipline, aggravates the Greatness of those Offences, undertakes to confute the Arguments for Remission and Indulgence; and, speaking of the above-mentioned Declaration, he calls it *a peremptory Decree*, and styles the Bishop, who made it, *high Pontiff*, and *Bishop of Bishops* [m]. Hence the Advocates for the See of *Rome* infer, that, even in those early Times, such Titles were given to the Bishop of *Rome*, and that his Decrees were even then deemed peremptory [n]. But, in the first Place, it is uncertain whether that Declaration was published by the Bishop of *Rome*, or by some other great Bishop, perhaps of *Carthage*, of *Alexandria*, or *Antioch*; for no Bishop is named by *Tertullian*. In the second Place, it is evident from the Context, that, in the above-mentioned Passage, *Tertul-*

Tertullian *falls off from the Church.*

The Titles of High Pontiff, *&c. whether, and in what Sense, given by* Tertullian *to the Bishop of* Rome.

[f] Euseb. l. 6. c. 14. [g] Euseb. l. 6. c. 14. Hier. vir. ill. c. 59. [h] Idem ib. c. 20. [i] Idem, l. 3. c. 31. [k] Theod. hæret. fab. l. 3. c. 2. [l] Hier. vir. ill. c. 53. [m] Tert. de Pudic. c. 1. [n] Bar. ad ann. 216. n. 5, 6, &c.

lian ſpeaks ironically; and conſequently all that can be inferred from thence is, that he gave thoſe Titles to the Catholic Biſhop, whoever he was, by way of Deriſion; or if the Biſhop had aſſumed them in his Declaration, he took from thence Occaſion to expoſe his Vanity and Ambition. *Baronius*, and the Flatterers of the Biſhops of *Rome*, triumph in this Paſſage of *Tertullian*; from which however nothing can be inferred in Favour of that See, unleſs they prove, which they can never do, that the above-mentioned Declaration or Decree was publiſhed by the Biſhop of *Rome*; that thoſe Titles, which raiſe him above other Biſhops, were Part of the Decree; and laſtly, that *Tertullian* mentioned them as due to him, and not by way of Sarcaſm, ironically reflecting on his Pride and Ambition.

As to the Actions of *Zephyrinus*, the Antients have left us quite in the Dark; and we cannot depend on what we read in the modern Writers. He governed about Seventeen Years, and died in the firſt Year of *Heliogabalus*, and 218. of the Chriſtian Æra [o]. In the *Roman* Martyrology he has a Place among the Martyrs, which puts *Baronius* himſelf to a Stand [p], ſince the Church enjoyed a profound Tranquillity from the Death of *Severus* to the End of his Pontificate.

Zephyrinus not a Martyr.

HELIOGABALUS, **CALLISTUS,** ALEXANDER SEVERUS.

Fifteenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 219.

Zephyrinus was ſucceeded by *Calliſtus*, or *Callixtus*, as he is ſtyled by *Optatus* [a], and St. *Auſtin* [b]. In his Time the Church enjoy'd a long, happy, and uninterrupted Peace, as *Tertullian* calls it [c], which laſted from the Death of *Severus* in 211. to the Reign of *Maximinus* in 235. as did alſo the State from the Death of *Macrinus* in 218. to the Year 233. *Alexander*, who ſucceeded *Heliogabalus* in 222. proved extremely favourable to the Chriſtians, and even allowed them, if I miſtake not the Meaning of a profane Writer, the free Exerciſe of their Religion [d]: it is at leaſt certain, that he adjudged to them, againſt the Tavern-keepers, a Piece of Ground, which it is pretended they

The Emperor Alexander *favourable to the Chriſtians.*

o Euſeb. l. 6. c. 21. & chron. p. 48. b Aug. ep. 53. Alex. p. 121. p Bar. ad ann. 221. n. 1, 2. a Opt. l. 2. c Tert. de cor. mil. d Lamprid. in vit.

had

had uſurped upon the Public, ſaying, when he gave Sentence in their Favour, that it was better God ſhould be ſerved on it in any Manner, than that it ſhould be occupied by Tavern-keepers [e]; which was giving them Leave to ſerve God on it after their own Manner. On this Spot of Ground, *Baronius* ſuppoſes *Calliſtus* to have built a Church in Honour of the Virgin *Mary*, known at preſent by the Name of *Santa Maria in Traſtevere*, that is, *Saint Mary beyond the Tyber* [f]. But the Pontifical of *Damaſus*, upon which alone he founds his Opinion, deſerves no Credit, as I ſhall ſhew in the Life of that Pope. *Calliſtus* is ſaid by *Anaſtaſius* [g] to have incloſed a large Piece of Ground on the *Appian* Way, to ſerve as a Burying-place for the Chriſtians. This Ground is frequently mentioned in the Martyrologies, and deſcribed at length by *Arringhus*, who tells us, that 174000 Martyrs, and 46 Popes, were buried in it [h]. Though *Alexander* was of all the Pagan Emperors the moſt favourable and indulgent to the Chriſtians, as is evident from all the antient Writers, both Chriſtians and Pagans, yet he is repreſented in the Martyrologies, and in the Acts of ſome Martyrs, eſpecially of *Calliſtus*, to which *Bede* gave an intire Credit [i], as the moſt barbarous and inhuman Tyrant that ever ſhed Chriſtian Blood. If we reject theſe Acts, and we muſt either reject them, or the Authority of the moſt unexceptionable Writers among the Antients, we expunge at once above 300 Martyrs out of the Catalogue of Saints worſhiped to this Day by the Church of *Rome*, upon the bare Authority of ſuch Acts. Among theſe are the Conſul *Palmatius*, with his Wife, his Children, and Forty-two of his Domeſtics; the Senator *Simplicius*, with his Wife, and Sixty-eight of his Domeſtics: and, what will be an irreparable Loſs, the ſo much celebrated St. *Cæcilia*, in whoſe Honour Churches have been erected in every Chriſtian Kingdom. *Baronius* not preſuming on one Side to queſtion the Emperor *Alexander*'s Kindneſs to the Chriſtians, which would be giving the Lye to all the Antients, but, on the other, looking upon it as a Sacrilege to rob the Church of ſo many valuable Reliques, aſcribes the cruel Uſage they are ſuppoſed to have met with in that Prince's Reign, not to him, but to *Ulpian* the celebrated Civilian, who flouriſhed under him [k]. But in thoſe Acts the Martyrs are ſaid to have ſuffered unheard-of Torments, there minutely de-

Calliſtus's *Burying-place.*

The Acts of Calliſtus *deſerve no Credit.*

Many Saints ought to be expunged out of the Catalogue.

[e] Idem ib. p. 131. [f] Bar. ad ann. 224. n. 4, 5. [g] Anaſt. in vit. Call. [h] Arring. l. 3. c. 11. [i] Bed. Martyr. 10 Maii, 14 Oct. [k] Bar. ad ann. 226. n. 4.

ſcribed, by the expreſs Command of the Emperor *Alexander*. Beſides, could *Alexaader* be ſaid to have favoured the Chriſtians, could the Chriſtians be ſaid to have enjoyed a happy Tranquillity under him, had one of his Officers perſecuted them with the utmoſt Cruelty in his Name, and by his Authority? *Baronius*, not remembering, it ſeems, that in this Place he had charged *Ulpian* with all the Cruelties againſt the Chriſtians, ſuppoſes elſewhere [l] ſeveral Martyrs to have ſuffered in the Reign of *Alexander*, after the Death of *Ulpian*. *Bede*, 'tis true, has followed theſe Acts; but they are not on that Account at all the more credible, ſince he often follows Pieces which are now univerſally given up as ſuppoſititious. The very firſt Words of theſe Acts are ſufficient to make us ſuſpect the Truth of them; for they begin thus; *In the Time of* Macrinus *and* Alexander——How come theſe two Princes to be joined together? *Macrinus* reigned with his Son *Diadumenus*, and *Heliogabalus* between them and *Alexander*. Soon after the Conſul *Palmatius* is ſaid to have been condemned without any Form of Judgment, without ſo much as being heard; whereas *Herodian* aſſures us, that *Alexander* was a ſtrict Obſerver of the Laws; and that no Criminal was condemned in his Reign, but according to the uſual Courſe of Law, and by Judges of the greateſt Integrity [m]. *Calliſtus*, if we give Credit to his Acts, was kept a long time Priſoner in a private Houſe, where he was every Day cruelly beaten by the Emperor *Alexander*'s Orders, and at laſt thrown headlong out of the Window into a Well. The Acts are evidently fabulous, but *Calliſtus* nevertheleſs is worſhiped among the Martyrs; and the Waters of the Well, which is to be ſeen at *Rome* in the Church that bears his Name, are ſaid to cure all ſorts of Diſeaſes to this Day. He governed the Church Five Years, and died in the Latter-end of the Year 223 [n]. the Third of the Emperor *Alexander*. His Body is expoſed to public Adoration on the Tenth of *May*, in the Church of St. *Mary*, beyond the *Tyber*, at *Rome* [o], and in that of our Lady at *Rheims* [p]. Two Decretals are aſcribed to *Calliſtus*, and likewiſe the Inſtitution of the Ember-Weeks, but without the leaſt Foundation.

Calliſtus *not a Martyr.*

[l] Idem ad ann. 232. n. 11. [m] Herod. l. 6. p. 575, 588. [n] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 21. & in chron. [o] Bolland. 10. Maii, 498, 499. [p] Arring. l. 2. c. 12. Theod. l. 4. c. 1, 2, 6, 8.

URBANUS,

ALEXANDER.

URBANUS,

Sixteenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

ALL I can find in the Antients concerning *Urban*, the Succeſſor of *Calliſtus*, is, that, during the whole Time of his Pontificate, both Church and State enjoyed a profound Peace under the Emperor *Alexander*; that he held the Chair near Seven Years, and died about the Middle of the Year 230 [q]. Great and wonderful Things are related of him in his Acts, and in thoſe of St. *Cæcilia*; but ſuch Acts [r] are evidently fabulous, ſince, in Oppoſition to all the Antients, they repreſent the Emperor *Alexander* as a moſt cruel Perſecutor of the Chriſtian Name. *Urban* himſelf is ſuppoſed to have ſuffered under him, and placed accordingly by the Church of *Rome* among her Martyrs. His Body is now worſhiped in an Abbey of his Name in the Dioceſe of *Chalons* on the *Marne*, *and in the Church of St.* Cæcilia *at* Rome [s].

Year of Chriſt 223.

The Acts of Urbanus *fabulous.*

ALEXANDER, MAXIMINUS.

PONTIANUS,

Seventeenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

PONTIANUS ſucceeded *Urban* in 230. and governed, according to the Pontifical of *Bucherius* (A), Five Years, Two Months, and Seven Days; that is, from the 22d of *July* 230. to the 28th of *September* 235 [t]. In the Second Year of his Pontificate, the famous

Year of Chriſt 230.

[q] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 26. Bolland. 25 Maii. [r] Bed. Martyr. & Boll. 25 Maii. [t] Bolland. April. t. 1. p. 25. [s] Eric. l. 1. c. 12.

(A) This Pontifical, well known to *Cuſpinian*, *F. Petau*, and other Chronologers, was publiſhed by *Bucherius* the *Jeſuit* in 1633. with the *Paſchal Cycle of Victorius*. It is a Catalogue of the Biſhops of *Rome*, from the Foundation of that See to the Time of *Liberius*, who was choſen in 352. As the Election of *Liberius* is marked, and not his Death, the Catalogue is ſuppoſed by ſome to have been written in his Time. His Election is marked thus; *Liberius fuit temporibus Conſtancii ex die* xi. *Kalendas Junias in diem — a Conſulibus Conſtantio* V. *& Conſtantio Cæſare* — By *Conſtantius Cæſar* is meant *Gallus*, the Son of *Julius Conſtantius*, who, by his Father *Conſtantius Chlorus*, was Half-brother to *Conſtantine the Great*. *Gallus* was raiſed by the Emperor *Conſtantius* to the Dignity of *Cæſar* in the Year 351. on which Occaſion he gave him his own Name (1), and the following Year took him for his Collegue in his Fifth Conſulſhip, as appears from *Idatius*, from *Proſper*, and from the *Alexandrian* Chronicle. The above-mentioned Pontifical is very faulty in the Times preceding

(1) Aurel. Vict. p. 518. Socr. l. 2. c. 28.

Origen *deposed.*

famous *Origen* was deposed and excommunicated by *Demetrius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and the Sentence approved of by most other Bishops, especially by the Bishop of *Rome*, who assembled, it seems, his Clergy

ceding the Pontificate of *Pontianus*, who was chosen in 230. nay, if we believe *Bucherius*, *Anicetus*, *Eleutherius*, and *Zephyrinus*, are omitted in it. I said, *If we believe* Bucherius; for *Bollandus*, another *Jesuit*, who perused the same Manuscript, assures us, that he found there the Names of those three Bishops, which *Bucherius* assures us were not to be found there (2). Which of two *Jesuits* is the honester is hard to determine in any Case, but impossible in this, unless the original Manuscript should be produced, which both perused. *F. Pagi*, the *Franciscan*, seems to favour *Bucherius*; for he complains of *Bollandus* for interpolating the Manuscript, and not publishing it with all its Faults and Chasms, as *Bucherius* had done. But then he does not tell us, that he had seen the original Manuscript. *Bollandus* on the other hand complains of *Bucherius* for undervaluing such an unvaluable Piece; and settles by it his whole Chronology of the Popes, pretending it to have been sent by Pope *Damasus* to St. *Jerom* (3). But for this the only Ground he has are some Letters from *Damasus* to St. *Jerom*, and from *Jerom* to *Damasus*, which, by the best Judges, are all thought suppositious. But even allowing it to have been sent by *Damasus* to St. *Jerom*, that ought not to recommend it more to our Esteem than it did to his; and he seems to have paid very little Regard to it: for in his Book of *Illustrious Men*, which he wrote after the Death of *Damasus*, he places *Clement* after *Anacletus*, though that Pontifical puts *Anacletus* after *Clement* (4).

What I have hitherto said is to be understood with respect to the Times preceding the Pontificate of *Pontianus*; for, from his Time, the Pontifical of *Bucherius* is almost quite exact to the End, that is, to the Election of *Liberius*; and the more exact, the nearer it comes to his Time. I said *almost*, for it is not even thenceforth free from all Faults; but it has fewer than any other antient Record that has reached us; and it is on this Consideration that, from the Time of *Pontianus*, I have preferred it to all others. With respect to his Predecessors, I have adopted the Chronology of *Eusebius*, where it does not appear that he was mistaken; for that he was mistaken in some Points, is but too plain; and, for aught we know, he may have been so in many others. But as in those dark Times we have no authentic Records, no indisputable Authorities, to depend on, I thought it more adviseable to tread in the Footsteps of so famous and antient a Writer, than, by attempting to open a new Way, perplex and confound both myself and the Reader, as *Pearson*, *Dodwell*, and *Pagi*, have done. And it was not, I must own, without some Concern, that I found a Man of Dr. *Pearson*'s Learning reduced, by undervaluing the Authority of *Eusebius*, to take for his Guide a Writer of no Authority at all, *viz.* *Eutychius* of *Alexandria*, who flourished so late as the Tenth Century, and is only famous for his Blunders, even in what relates to his own Church.

To the Pontifical were annexed, in the same antient Manuscript, several other small Pieces, *viz.* 1. A List of the Consuls from the Year 205. to 354. with the Epacts, Bissextile Years, and the Day of the Week, with which each Year began. There are some Mistakes in the Epacts, but the rest is done with great Exactness. 2. Another List of the Consuls and Governors of *Rome*, from the Year 254. to 354. 3. A short Necrology of the Bishops of *Rome*, in which are marked, according to the Order of the Months, the Day on which each of them died, and the Place where he was buried. It begins with *Lucius*, and ends with *Julius*. In this List, *Sixtus* II. and *Marcellus* are omitted; the latter probably by a Mistake of the Transcriber, confounding him with his Predecessor *Marcellinus*; and the former, perhaps, because he is set down in the Calendar of Martyrs annexed to the Necrology. These Pieces, as well as the Pontifical, all end at the Year 354. whence Cardinal *Noris* (5) and others are of Opinion, that they were written that Year.

(2) Bolland. Apr. t. 1. p. 22,—24. (3) Bolland. ib. p. 3. n. 10. (4) Hier. de vir. illustr. c. 15. (5) Fast. consular. p. 23.

on

on that Occaſion: For what elſe could St. *Jerom* mean, by telling us, that *Rome aſſembled her Senate againſt Origen* [u]? The calm and quiet Days, which the Church had for ſome Years enjoyed, eſpecially under *Alexander*, expired almoſt with the Pontificate of *Pontianus*; for that excellent Prince being aſſaſſinated in the Month of *May* 235. *Maximinus*, who ſucceeded him, out of Hatred to him, began to perſecute with great Cruelty the Chriſtians, whom he had ſo much favoured, eſpecially the Biſhops [x]. *Pontianus* among the reſt was baniſhed *Rome*, and confined to the unwholſome Iſland of *Sardinia* [y], where he died the ſame Year on the 28th of *September*, but of what Kind of Death is not well known [z].

The Perſecution of Maximinus.

Pontianus *baniſhed to* Sardinia.

MAXIMINUS.

ANTERUS,

Eighteenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

ANTERUS, the Succeſſor of *Pontianus*, preſided only One Month and Ten Days, and died on the 3d of *January* 236 [a]. Some modern Writers place one *Cyriacus* between him and *Pontianus*; but their Opinion, founded on the Authority of the fabulous Acts of St. *Urſula*, is ſufficiently confuted by *Euſebius* [b], *Optatus* [c], St. *Auguſtine* [d], and *Nicephorus* [e], who all name *Anterus* as the immediate Succeſſor of *Pontianus*. The Shortneſs of his Pontificate, and the cruel Perſecution carried on by *Maximinus*, give us Room to believe, that he died a Martyr, which Title is given him in the Martyrologies of St. *Jerom* and *Bede* [f].

Year of Chriſt 235.

Anterus *probably dies a Martyr.*

MAXIMINUS, GORDIAN, PHILIP, DECIUS.

FABIANUS,

Nineteenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

FABIANUS, called by the *Greeks*, *Fabius*, by *Eutychius* [g], and in the Chronicle of *Alexandria*, *Flavianus* [h], was, according to *Euſebius*, miraculouſly choſen for Succeſſor to *Anterus*; for he tells us,

Year of Chriſt 236.

[u] Ruf. in Hier. l. 2. p. 225. [x] Oroſ. l. 7. c. 19. [y] Vide Hallo. vit. Orig. p. 20. [z] Vide Boll. Apr. t. 1. p. 25. [a] Boll. pont. p. 28—32. [b] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 22. [c] Opt. contr. Par. l. 2. [d] Aug. ep. 165. [e] Niceph. chron. [f] Vide Flor. p. 995—997. [g] Euty. p. 384 [h] Chron. Al. p. 630.

His miraculous Election. That the People and Clergy being assembled in order to proceed to a new Election, a Dove, unexpectedly appearing, settled, to the great Surprize of all present, on the Head of *Fabianus*, who was not so much as thought of, being but a Layman, as appears from the Account, and not an Inhabitant of *Rome*, but just then come out of the Country. At this Prodigy the whole Assembly cried out with one Voice, Fabianus *is our Bishop*; and, crouding round him, placed him without further Delay on the Episcopal Throne.—Thus *Eusebius* [i]: and to his Account is owing the modern Notion, that the Pope is always chosen by the Holy Ghost. *Not all Popes thus chosen.* *What happened in the Election of* St. Fabianus (says Cardinal *Cusani*) *happens in the Election of every Pope. 'Tis true we do not see the Holy Ghost with our corporeal Eyes; but we may and must see him, if we are not quite blind, with those of the Mind. In vain therefore, O eminent Electors, are all your Intrigues; the Person, on whose Head the heavenly Dove is pleased to perch, will, in spite of them, be chosen* [k]. In the Sequel of this History, we shall see such Monsters of Iniquity elected, and by such scandalous Practices, that to imagine the Holy Ghost any-ways concerned in the Election would be absolute Blasphemy.

Fabianus *worthy of the Dignity to which he was raised.* As for *Fabianus*, he seems to have been well worthy of the Post to which he was raised; for the famous Bishop of *Carthage*, St. *Cyprian*, in Answer to the Letter, wherein the Clergy of *Rome* gave him an Account of the glorious Death of their Bishop, calls him *an excellent Man*; and adds, that *the Glory of his Death had answered the Purity, Holiness, and Integrity of his Life* [l]. *Some of his Regulations.* From the Pontifical of *Bucherius* we learn, that he appointed Seven Deacons over the Fourteen Regions, or Wards, into which *Rome* was then divided [m], to take care of the Poor, says *Baronius* [n]. We read in other more modern Pontificals, that he named Seven Subdeacons to overlook the Seven Notaries, who are supposed to have been first appointed by Pope *Clement*, and whose Province it was to commit to Writing the Actions and Speeches of the Martyrs. It is manifest from St. *Cyprian* [o], as Dr. *Pearson* well observes, that in the Time of *Cornelius*, the Successor of *Fabianus*, the Church of *Rome* had Seven Subdeacons, to whom St. *Cyprian* recommended the strictest Exactness in marking the Day of each Martyr's Death [p]. As for taking down their Speeches, which

[i] Euseb. l. 6. c.29. [k] Card. Cus. de meth. consistorii, c.7. p. 85. [l] Cypr. ep. 4. & 31. [m] Buch. cycl. 271. [n] Bar. ad ann. 112. n. 9. [o] Cyp. ep. 37. [p] Pearf. posth. p. 19.

some

ſome ſeem to object to, the Art of writing in Short-hand was well known in thoſe Times. *Euſebius* tells us, that by *Tiro*, *Cicero*'s Freed-man, were firſt invented certain Marks, which ſtood not only for whole Words, but intire Sentences [q]. But this Invention is, by *Dio*, aſcribed to *Mæcenas*, who ordered his Freed-man *Aquila* to make them known to all who cared to learn them [r]. Of their wonderful Quickneſs in writing, with the Help of theſe Marks, *Martial* takes notice, in one of his Diſtichs, ſaying, How faſt ſoever the Tongue may run, the Hand runs faſter [s].

Said to have converted the Emperor Philip.

Baronius [t] and *Bollandus* [u] aſcribe to *Fabianus* the Converſion of the Emperor *Philip*, and his Son; adding, from the Acts of *Pontius* the Martyr, that he pulled down the great Temple of the *Romans*, that he daſhed to Pieces their Idols, and converted the whole City. What a Pity that ſuch wonderful Feats ſhould have been paſſed over in Silence by *Euſebius*, and all the Antients! As for the Converſion of *Philip*, and his Son, it is queſtioned by many, and very juſtly, the Silence of *Euſebius* alone being an unanſwerable Evidence againſt it; but all agree, that if he was inſtructed and converted by *Fabianus*, he did no great Honour either to his Inſtructor, or his Religion. In the Latter-end of the Year 249. the Emperor *Philip* being killed by the rebellious Soldiery at *Verona*, *Decius*, who was raiſed to the Empire in his Room, began his Reign with the moſt dreadful Perſecution that had ever yet afflicted the Church. *Fabianus* was one of the firſt that fell a Victim to the implacable Hatred this Emperor bore to the Chriſtian Name. He was put to Death on the 20th of *January* 250. while *Decius* was Conſul the ſecond time, together with *Gratus*, after having governed the Church Fourteen Years, one Month, and Ten Days [w].

Fabianus *martyred in the Perſecution of* Decius.

The Death of *Fabianus* was followed by a Vacancy, which laſted at leaſt Sixteen Months, the Chriſtians being either impriſoned, or ſo diſperſed, that they could not aſſemble to chooſe a new Biſhop. During this Interval, the Clergy, that is, the Presbyters and Deacons, took upon themſelves the Care and Adminiſtration of all Eccleſiaſtical Matters; and, being informed by *Clementius*, Subdeacon of the Church of *Carthage*, who came to *Rome* about *Eaſter* in 250. that St. *Cyprian* had been obliged, by the Fury of the Perſecution, to withdraw for a

The See vacant, Year of Chriſt 250.

[q] Euſeb. in chron. ann. 246. n. 9. [r] Dio Olymp. 193. ann. 4. [s] Mart. l. 14. [t] Bar. [u] Boll. 20. Jan. p. 253. [w] Buch. cycl. p. 267.

while from his See, they wrote to that Clergy, exhorting them to follow their Example[x]. Several excellent Letters paſſed on this Occaſion between the Clergy of *Rome*, and St. *Cyprian* and his Clergy, eſpecially concerning the Method they were to hold with the *Lapſed*; that is, with thoſe who had either obtained of the Pagan Magiſtrates Protections, or *Libels of Safety*, whence they were called *Libellatici*, or had actually ſacrificed to Idols, and were thence named *Sacrificati*. In one of theſe Letters, the *Roman* Clergy, after having maturely examined ſo material a Point, and adviſed not only with the neighbouring Biſhops, but with others, who, from the diſtant Provinces, had fled for Concealment to *Rome*, declare it was their Opinion, That ſuch of the Lapſed as were at the Point of Death, ſhould, upon an unfeigned Repentance, be admitted to the Communion of the Chnrch, but that the Cauſe of others ſhould be put off till the Election of a new Biſhop, when, together with him, with other Biſhops, with the Prieſts, Deacons, Confeſſors, and Laymen, who had ſtood firm, they ſhould take their Caſe into Conſideration; adding, that a Crime committed by many ought not to be judged by one; and that a Decree could not be binding without the Conſent and Approbation of many[y]. Could they in more plain and expreſs Terms diſown the Infallibility of the Pope their Biſhop? Could they upon mature Deliberation write thus, and at the ſame time believe his Judgment an infallible Rule? Such a Propoſition would in theſe Days be deemed heretical; and no Wonder; the Pope's Infallibility muſt be maintained at all Events; and to maintain it is impoſſible, without condemning, as heretical, the Doctrine taught by the Church in the firſt and pureſt Ages.

The Opinion of the Roman *Clergy concerning the Lapſed.*

They diſown the Pope's Infallibility.

[x] Cypr. ep. 3. [y] Idem ep. 31.

CORNELIUS,

DECIUS, **CORNELIUS,** GALLUS.

Twentieth BISHOP *of* Rome.

AFTER the See had been vacant for the Space of Sixteen Months, *Cornelius*, a Presbyter of the Church of *Rome*, was at last elected [z], on the 4th of *June* 251. according to the most probable Opinion [a]. He was, according to St. *Cyprian* [b], a Man of an unblemished Character, and, on account of his peaceable Temper, his great Modesty, his Integrity, and many other eminent Virtues, well worthy of the Dignity to which he was raised. He did not attain at once, says the same Writer, to the Height of the Priesthood, but after he had passed through all the inferior Degrees, agreeably to the Discipline of the Church. He was so far from using Intrigues, from intruding himself by Violence, as some have done, that Violence was necessary to make him accept the Dignity offered him. He was ordained Bishop, continues St. *Cyprian*, by some of our Collegues, who, being then at *Rome*, conformed to the Judgment of the whole People and Clergy [c]. As *Decius* was still alive, who had declared, that he had rather bear with a Competitor to his Crown, than with a Bishop of *Rome* [d], the Christians, in all Likelihood, laid hold of the Opportunity, which the Revolt of *Valens* gave them, to choose a new Bishop; for this very Year *Julius Valens* revolting, caused himself to be proclaimed Emperor in *Rome* [e]; and though he held the Empire but a very short time, yet his Revolt might divert *Decius* for a while from persecuting the Christians.

Year of Christ 251.

The Character of Cornelius *by St.* Cyprian.

Though *Cornelius* was chosen by the unanimous Voice of the People and Clergy, yet *Novatian*, a Presbyter of the Church of *Rome*, who aspired at the same Dignity, not only refused to acknowlege him; but having gained a considerable Party among the People, Five Presbyters, and some Confessors, he wrote in their Name and his own to St. *Cyprian*, and no doubt to many other Bishops, laying heinous Crimes to the Charge of *Cornelius*; namely, his having sued for a Protection from the Pagan Magistrates, which was ranking him among the *Libellatici*, who were excluded from all Dignities and

Novatianus *refuses to acknowlege him.*

Writes to St. Cyprian *against him.*

[z] Eusеb. chron. & l. 6. c. 33. Opt. l. 2. Aug. ep. 165, &c. [a] Vide Pearс. Cyp. an. p. 29. n. 6. [b] Cypr. ep. 52. [c] Idem ib. [d] Idem ep. 52. [e] Aur. Vict.

Employments in the Church. St. *Cyprian* having received this Letter, and at the ſame time one from *Cornelius* acquainting him with his Election, as was cuſtomary in thoſe Times among Biſhops, he cauſed the one to be read in a full Aſſembly of the People and Clergy, but ſuppreſſed the other, looking upon it as a ſcandalous Libel [f]. However, to prevent the Calumnies and falſe Reports that might be ſpread abroad by *Novatian* and his Partiſans, he aſſembled a Council of all the Biſhops of his Province, who, hearing of the Schiſm in the Church of *Rome*, reſolved to ſend thither two of their Body, who ſhould carefully inform themſelves of what had paſſed in the late Election, and on their Return make a faithful Report of all they had learnt. Purſuant to this Reſolution, *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, two *African* Biſhops, were diſpatched to *Rome* with Letters from the Council to the Clergy of that City, and to the Biſhops who had been preſent at the Ordination of *Cornelius*. The Biſhops no ſooner received theſe Letters than they anſwered them, aſſuring their Brethren in *Africa*, that *Cornelius* had been lawfully choſen; and at the ſame time commending him as a Perſon, on account of his extraordinary Piety, and exemplary Life, moſt worthy of the Dignity to which he had been raiſed. Their Teſtimony was ſoon after confirmed by *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus* returning from *Rome*, and likewiſe by *Stephanius* and *Pompeius*, two *African* Biſhops, who had aſſiſted at the Ordination of *Cornelius*; ſo that he was univerſally acknowleged all over *Africa* [g].

St. Cyprian *calls a Council,*

which acknowleges Cornelius.

The *African* Biſhops no ſooner acknowleged *Cornelius* than they acquainted him with the Reſolutions, which they had taken in their late Council, with reſpect to the Lapſed. The Subſtance of theſe was, That ſuch as had yielded to the Fury of the Perſecution ought not to be abandoned, leſt, giving themſelves up to Deſpair, they ſhould fall into a total Apoſtaſy; but ſhould be re-admitted to the Union of the Church upon a ſincere Repentance, and after a long Penance: that the Time of their Penance ſhould be ſhortened, or prolonged, according to the Nature of their Crimes; that is, the *Libellatici* ſhould have a ſhorter Time aſſigned them; and the *Sacrificati*, called alſo *Thurificati*, who had actually offered Sacrifice, or Frankincenſe, to Idols, ſhould not be admitted till they had expiated their Offence by a very long Penance; but that both the *Libellatici* and *Sacrificati*

Reſolutions of the Council of Africa *concerning the Lapſed.*

[f] Idem ep. 42. [g] Idem ep. 41, 42, 45.

ſhould

ſhould be taken in, before the Time of their Penance was expired, if at the Point of Death, or even thought to be in Danger [h]. As to fallen Biſhops, they were to be dealt with in the ſame Manner; and, after due Penance, or, as it is ſometimes called, Satisfaction, be admitted only in a Lay Capacity [i]. *Cornelius* did not, upon the Receipt of theſe Determinations or Decrees, ſtep into his oracular Chair, and thence, as an infallible Judge, condemn or approve them. Such arbitrary Proceedings would not have been well reliſhed by the Biſhops of *Africa*, nor even by his own Clergy, who not long before had declared, That *a Decree could not be binding without the Conſent and Approbation of many*. He therefore acted on this Occaſion as St. *Cyprian* had done, as other Biſhops did afterwards; that is, he aſſembled a Council, which *Euſebius* calls *a great Council* [k]; for it conſiſted of Sixty Biſhops, and a great Number of Prieſts, Deacons, and Laymen, who, in thoſe Times, were admitted to all Councils [l]. By this Venerable Aſſembly were the Decrees of the Council of *Africa* examined and approved, and then ſent to be in like-manner examined and approved by other Biſhops, till the whole Church had agreed to them [m].

Which are approved by the Council of Rome.

At the Council of *Rome* aſſiſted among other Presbyters *Novatian*, but as he maintained in Oppoſition to the whole Aſſembly, that the Lapſed were to be admitted upon no Terms or Satisfaction whatſoever, but ſhould be left to the Divine Tribunal, he was himſelf cut off from that Communion, which with an invincible Obſtinacy he denied to others [n]. Provoked at this Sentence, he readily gave Ear to the Inſinuations of *Novatus*, a Presbyter of the Church of *Carthage*, who had fled from thence to *Rome*, to avoid the Sentence of Excommunication, with which he was threatened by St. *Cyprian*, and the other Biſhops of *Africa*, for his ſcandalous Doctrine, and irregular Practices [o]. *Pacianus* paints him in the blackeſt Colours: He ſtriped the Orphans, ſays he, plundered the Widows of the Church of *Carthage*, and appropriated to himſelf the Money belonging to the Poor and the Church [p]: He turned his Father out of Doors, and let him die of Hunger in the Streets, and would not even be at the Trouble of burying him after his Death. With a Kick in the Belly he made his Wife miſcarry, and bring forth a dead Child: whence *Pacian* calls

Novatian *excommunicated.*

Novatus *his Wickedneſs.*

[h] Idem ep. 52, 54. [i] Idem ep. 68. [k] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 43. [l] Pacian. ep. 3. [m] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 24. [n] Theodoret. hær. fab. l. 3. c. 5. [o] Pacian. ep. 3. Hier. vir. ill. c. 70. Cypr. ep. 49. [p] Pacian. ep. 3.

him

him a Traitor, an Aſſaſſin, the Murderer of his Father and Child [q]. As for his Doctrine, he held, while at *Carthage*, Tenets diametrically oppoſite to thoſe he taught at *Rome*: for, at *Carthage*, he was for admitting to the Communion of the Church not only the Lapſed, but all other Sinners, let their Crimes be ever ſo heinous, without any Sort of Penance; and, at *Rome*, for excluding them, let their Penance be ever ſo long, let their Repentance be ever ſo ſincere [r]. At *Carthage* he found *Feliciſſimus*, of whom I ſhall ſpeak hereafter, inclined to Lenity; and *Novatian*, at *Rome*, to Severity: and therefore, as he was a Man of great Vanity, and no Principles, he ſuited himſelf to the different Tempers of ſuch as he judged the moſt capable of raiſing him. At *Rome*, by a Pretence to an uncommon Sanctity and Severity, he gained a great many Followers, and among them ſome Confeſſors lately delivered out of Priſon, from whom he extorted Letters directed to *Novatian*, wherein they conſented to the Ordination of the ſaid *Novatian*. In virtue of theſe Letters he was accordingly ordained, ſome ſay in *Rome* [s], others in a neighbouring Village [t], by Three Biſhops ſent for by *Novatus* out of the Country for that Purpoſe, and quite unacquainted with his Views. Being thus ordained Biſhop, he was ſet up by the Party againſt *Cornelius*, whom they charged with relaxing the Diſcipline of the Church, and communicating with the Lapſed, eſpecially with one *Trophimus*. This St. *Cyprian* calls a falſe and groundleſs Charge; for, as to *Trophimus*, though he was in the Number of the *Thurificati*, that is, though he had offered Frankincenſe to Idols, and even perſuaded his Flock (for he was a Presbyter, if not a Biſhop) to follow his Example, yet he had ſufficiently atoned for his Crime, by a ſincere Repentance, by a long Penance, and, above all, by bringing back his People with him, who would not have returned without him [u]. As for the others, 'tis true he communicated, with ſome who had not fulfilled the Time of Penance aſſigned them, but ſuch only as, being admitted at the Point of Death, had afterwards recovered; which can no otherwiſe be avoided, ſays St. *Cyprian* [w], but by killing thoſe to whom we granted the Peace of the Church, when we apprehended them to be in Danger. *Novatian* having thus, by a pretended Zeal for the Diſcipline of the Church, and the artful Inſinuations of *Novatus*, ſeduced a great many at *Rome*, who ſtyled themſelves the *Cathari*,

He gains many Followers, and ſome Confeſſors, to the Party of Novatian.

Novatian *the firſt* Anti-pope.

[q] Id. ib. & ep. 2. [r] Cyp. ep. 40, 49. [s] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 43. [t] Theod. l. 3. c. 5. [u] Cyp. ep. 54. [w] Idem ib.

that

that is, the pure, undefiled Party; he wrote in their and his own Name to the other Churches, acquainting them with his Ordination, exhorting them not to communicate with the Lapſed upon any Terms, and bitterly complaining of the ſcandalous Lenity and Remiſneſs of *Cornelius* [x]. At the ſame time *Cornelius* wrote to the other Biſhops, giving them a faithful Account of all that had happened at *Rome*, eſpecially of the uncanonical Ordination of *Novatian*. However, the Letters of *Novatian*, ſigned by ſeveral Confeſſors, who were greatly reſpected in thoſe Days, made no ſmall Impreſſion on *Antonianus* an *African* Biſhop, and *Fabius* Biſhop of *Antioch* [y], but quite gained over to the Party *Marcianus* Biſhop of *Arles* [z]. The other Biſhops declared all to a Man for *Cornelius*, eſpecially St. *Cyprian*, and thoſe of his Province, who, being aſſembled in a Council when the Deputies of *Novatianus* arrived, excommunicated without farther Examination both him and them [a]; and well they might, ſince they had taken ſo much Pains to inform themſelves of the Lawfulneſs of *Cornelius*'s Election, as we have related above. The Deputies, though thus rejected with Scorn and Diſgrace by the Council, did not abandon the Enterprize, but proſelyting from Town to Town, nay, from Houſe to Houſe, inveigled a great many, under colour of communicating with the Confeſſors [b]. St. *Cyprian* therefore, whoſe Zeal was not confined within the Bounds, however extenſive, of *Africa*, *Numidia*, and the Two *Mauritania's*, to withdraw this main Support from the Party, wrote a ſhort but nervous Letter to the Confeſſors, deploring the Fault they had committed, by conſenting to the unlawful Ordination of *Novatianus*, and exhorting them to return with all Speed to the Catholic Church [c]. *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* wrote them a pathetic Letter to the ſame Purpoſe [d]; and theſe Letters had at laſt the deſired Effect; but not before *Novatus*, who had drawn them into the Schiſm, left *Rome*; which happened on the following Occaſion:

He acquaints the other Churches with his Ordination.

His Deputies rejected and excommunicated in Africa.

St. Cyprian *endeavours to reclaim the Confeſſors.*

Novatianus, being informed that the Deputies he had ſent into *Africa* were every-where rejected and deſpiſed, reſolved to ſend others, whom he judged, on account of their Rank and Authority, more capable of promoting his Deſign [e]. The Perſons he pitched upon were *Nicoſtratus*, *Novatus*, *Evariſtus*, *Primus*, and *Dionyſius*. Of

Novatian *ſends new Deputies into* Africa.

[x] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 45. Socrat. l. 4. c. 28. Hier. vir. ill. c. 69. [y] Cyp. ep. 52.
Euſeb. l. 6. c. 44. [z] Cyp. ep. 67. [a] Idem ib. [b] Idem ep. 47, 79.
[c] Idem ep. 44. [d] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 46. [e] Cyp. ep. 48.

the Two laſt I find no farther Mention made in Hiſtory; of *Novatus* I have ſpoken above; and as for *Evariſtus* and *Nicoſtratus*, the former was a Biſhop, and is ſuppoſed to have been one of the Three that ordained *Novatian*. *Nicoſtratus* was a Deacon of the Church of *Rome* [f], and had been impriſoned with the Two Presbyters *Moſes* and *Maximus*, for the Confeſſion of the Faith [g], which intitled him to a Place among the Confeſſors. To theſe Three St. *Cyprian* aſcribes the excellent Letter, as he ſtyles it, which the Confeſſors of *Rome* wrote to thoſe of *Carthage* [h]. He was likewiſe one of the Confeſſors, who wrote to St. *Cyprian* himſelf, as appears from the Title of that admirable Letter, which runs thus: *The Presbyters* Moſes *and* Maximus, *the Deacons* Nicoſtratus *and* Ruffinus, *and the other Confeſſors, who are with them, to Pope* Cyprian [i]. We may here obſerve, by the way, that the Name of *Pope*, which ſignifies no more than *Father*, was antiently common to all Biſhops; but was afterwards, by a ſpecial Decree of *Gregory* VII. appropriated to the Biſhop of *Rome*. To return to *Nicoſtratus*, the Character given him by St. *Cyprian* and *Cornelius*, beſpeaks him quite unworthy of being joined with the others, who are named in that Letter, and were all Men of great Piety: for he had ſquandered away the Money belonging to the Church, that was lodged in his Hands, embezzled that of the Widows and Orphans, and defrauded a Lady, who had truſted him with the Management of her Affairs [k].

Their Characters.

The Name of Pope antiently common to all Biſhops.

Theſe new Deputies met with no better a Reception than the former had done: for St. *Cyprian*, being informed of their Departure from *Rome*, by the Confeſſor *Augendus* [l], and ſoon after of their Characters by the Acolyte *Nicephorus*, both ſent, for that Purpoſe, by *Cornelius* [m], he acquainted therewith the other Catholic Biſhops, who, upon that Intelligence, rejected them with the greateſt Indignation, as Apoſtates, and Firebrands of Sedition. Hereupon the Deputies having, by the Means and Contrivance of *Novatus*, procured ſome of their Party to be ordained Biſhops, and *Nicoſtratus* among the reſt, they named them to the Sees of the Catholic Biſhops; which bred great Confuſion and Diſorder in the Church, it being a difficult Matter for the Biſhops in the diſtant Provinces to diſtinguiſh between their lawful Brethren and the Intruders, and conſequently to know whom they ſhould admit to, and whom they ſhould exclude

The Deputies are everywhere rejected in Africa.

[f] Idem ep. 49. [g] Buch. p. 271. [h] Cyp. ep. 23. [i] Idem ep. 26. [k] Idem ep. 48, 49. [l] Idem ep. 48, [m] Idem ep. 49.

from,

from, their Communion. But, againſt this Evil, a Remedy was found by St. *Cyprian*, and the other *African* Biſhops, who, to arm him againſt the Craft and Arts of thoſe ſubtle Impoſtors, tranſmitted to him a Liſt of all the Catholic Biſhops of that Province [n].

The Confeſſors return to the Communion of the Church.

The Storm, which *Novatus* had raiſed in *Rome*, was laid by his Departure; for he was no ſooner gone, than the Confeſſors, whom he had ſeduced, *viz. Maximus*, *Urbanus*, *Sidonius*, and *Macarius*, ſignified to *Cornelius* their eager Deſire of quitting his Party, and returning to the Communion of the Church. *Cornelius* queſtioned, at firſt, their Sincerity; but, being convinced of it at laſt, he aſſembled his Clergy, not caring to truſt to his own Judgment, in order to adviſe with them, in what manner he ſhould proceed, in the preſent Caſe. At this Council aſſiſted, beſides the *Roman* Clergy, Five Biſhops, who either happened to be then at *Rome*; or, on this Occaſion, had been invited thither by *Cornelius*. They were ſcarce met, when the Confeſſors, attended by a great Croud, appeared before them, teſtifying, with a Flood of Tears, the Sincerity of their Repentance, and begging they would forget their paſt criminal Conduct. The Council did not think it adviſeable to come to any Reſolution, till they had acquainted the People with the Requeſt of the Confeſſors; which they no ſooner did, than the People flocked to the Place, and, not upbraiding, but embracing, with Tears of Joy, their retrieved Brethren, and with the ſame Tenderneſs as if they had been juſt then delivered out of Priſon, pointed out to the Council the Method they were to purſue. Accordingly *Cornelius*, having, with the Approbation of the Council, made them renounce the Errors of *Novatian*, and acknowlege him for the only lawful Biſhop of *Rome*, re-admitted them, without farther Satisfaction, to the Communion of the Church [o]. From this Account I ſhould imagine, that thoſe who accompanied the Confeſſors, at their firſt appearing before the Council, were *Novatians*, whom they had brought back with them; but I dare not affirm it, ſince St. *Cyprian*, in his Anſwer to *Cornelius*, ſpeaks only of the Four above-mentioned Confeſſors.

How received.

Cornelius acquaints St. Cyprian with their Return.

The Confeſſors being thus returned, to the inexpreſſible Joy of the whole People, *Cornelius*, impatient to impart the good News to St. *Cyprian*, wrote to him, as ſoon as the Council broke up, to acquaint him with what had happened, and invite him to partake of the common Joy, to

[n] Idem ep. 55. [o] Idem ep. 46. Euſeb. l. 6. c. 43.

which he had ſo much contributed [p]. With this Letter *Nicephorus* the Acolyte embarked, without Delay, for *Africa*; and thence returned ſoon after with an Anſwer, wherein St. *Cyprian* aſſured *Cornelius*, that the Return of the Confeſſors had cauſed an univerſal Joy in *Africa*, both for their Sake, and becauſe it might open the Eyes of many, and prove in the end the Ruin of the ſchiſmatic Party [q]. The Confeſſors themſelves wrote to St. *Cyprian*, upon their Return [r], who immediately anſwered them [s]; and, in all Likelihood, to the other chief Biſhops of the Church, ſince *Euſebius* informs us, that *Dionyſius*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, wrote twice to them after their Return [t]. In the mean time *Novatian*, ſeeing great Numbers, moved by the Example of the Confeſſors, daily fall off from his Party, to keep the reſt ſteady by the moſt ſacred Ties, uſed, in adminiſtring the Euchariſt, to hold the Hands of thoſe who received it, with the holy Bread in them, between his, and oblige them to ſwear, *by the Body and Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, that they would never abandon him, nor return to *Cornelius* [u].

The Confeſſors write to St. Cyprian.

In what manner Novatian *endeavoured to keep the reſt ſteady.*

A Schiſm in the Church of Carthage.

As the Church of *Rome* was rent by the Schiſm of *Novatian*, ſo was the Church of *Carthage* by that of *Feliciſſimus*; and as the former, upon his being excommunicated by *Cornelius*, and the Council of *Rome*, had recourſe to St. *Cyprian*, in like manner the latter, being cut off from the Communion of the Church by St. *Cyprian*, and the Council of *Carthage*, had Recourſe to *Cornelius*. But as the Doctrine of *Feliciſſimus*, though diametrically oppoſite to that of *Novatian*, was equally repugnant to the Catholic Truth, to the Diſcipline eſtabliſhed in the Church, as I have obſerved above, he was at firſt rejected by *Cornelius*, with great Steadineſs and Reſolution. But the Biſhop of *Rome* had, at laſt, been frightened into a Compliance, had he not been animated and encouraged by St. *Cyprian*: for the Followers of *Feliciſſimus* having, in Imitation of the *Novatians*, appointed one of their own Faction, named *Fortunatus*, Biſhop of *Carthage*, *Feliciſſimus* took upon himſelf to carry to *Cornelius* the Letters of the new and Third Biſhop of that City. Accordingly he ſet out for *Rome*, attended by a Troop of ſeditious, deſperate, and abandoned Men, ſays St. *Cyprian* [w]. *Cornelius* rejected them at firſt with great Firmneſs, and immediately acquainted St. *Cyprian* with what had paſſed; but *Feliciſſimus* threatening to read publicly the

[p] Cyp. ep. 46. [q] Idem ep. 47. [r] Idem ep. 50. [s] Idem ep. 51. [t] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 43. [u] Idem ib. [w] Idem ep. 55.

Letters

Letters he had brought, if *Cornelius* did not receive them, and to diſcover many ſcandalous things, he was not a little intimidated. He therefore wrote a ſecond Letter to St. *Cyprian*, but betrayed in it a great deal of Fear and Weakneſs: however, the excellent Letter, which St. *Cyprian* wrote in Anſwer to his, inſpired him with new Vigour, and kept him ſteady [x].

The Perſecution renewed by Gallus.

In the mean Time, *Decius* being killed, the Perſecution was carried on, or rather renewed, with more Fury than ever, by *Gallus* his Succeſſor. As the *Roman* Empire was, at this Time, afflicted with a dreadful Plague, *Gallus*, who, it ſeems, had not moleſted the Chriſtians during the firſt Months of his Reign [y], iſſued an Order, injoining Men of all Ranks and Profeſſions to offer Sacrifice to the Gods, hoping, by that means, to appeaſe their Wrath, and put a Stop to the raging Evil. It was on Occaſion of this Plague that St. *Cyprian* wrote his excellent Diſcourſe on *Mortality*, wherein he ſo eloquently teaches a Chriſtian to triumph over the Fears of Death, and ſhews with how little Reaſon we mourn for thoſe Friends and Relations who are ſnatched from us. Such of the Chriſtians as refuſed to comply with the Emperor's Edict, were either baniſhed or executed.

Cornelius *apprehended.*

Cornelius, among the reſt, was apprehended at the firſt breaking out of the Perſecution, and made a glorious Confeſſion of his Faith, as appears from St. *Cyprian*, who, on that Occaſion, wrote him a Letter of Congratulation [z]. What happened to him afterwards is uncertain; for his Acts are evidently fabulous, though they have been received by *Bede*, by *Ado*, by *Anaſtaſius*, and many others, far more conſiderable for their Number than their Authority. We read in the Pontifical of *Bucherius*, that he was baniſhed to *Centumcellæ*, now *Civita-vecchia*, and died of a natural Death, according to the Expreſſion uſed there [a] *(Dormitionem accepit)*. As to the Title of Martyr, with which he is diſtinguiſhed by St. *Jerom* [b], it was antiently given to all thoſe who, for the Confeſſion of Faith, died in Priſon, which in all Likelihood happened to *Cornelius* (A).

Corne-

[x] Idem ep. 55. [y] Idem ep. 54. [z] Idem ep. 57. [a] Buch. p. 271. [b] Hier. vit. Paul. p. 237.

(A) *Cornelius* is reckoned, by St. *Jerom*, among the Eccleſiaſtic Writers, on account of the Four Letters, which he wrote to *Fabius* Biſhop of *Antioch*, who ſeemed not to diſlike the Tenets of *Novatian* (1). He wrote ſeveral other Letters, whereof Two are ſtill extant among thoſe of St. *Cyprian* (2); and ſome Fragments of his

(1) Hier. vir. ill. c. 66. p. 290. (2) Cypr. ep. 46, 48.

Cornelius died on the ſame Day of the Month and the Week, on which St. *Cyprian* was martyred Six Years after [c]; that is, on the 14th of *September* 252. according to the moſt probable Opinion, having held the Pontificate one Year, Three Months, and Ten Days.

His Reliques. His Body is ſuppoſed to have been tranſlated from *Civita-vecchia* to the Cemetery of *Calliſtus*; for near that Place Pope *Leo* I. is ſaid to have built, in Honour of *Cornelius*, a Baſilic, or magnificent Church [d]. His Body was believed to be ſtill at *Rome* in the End of the Eighth Century; for *Anaſtaſius* tells us, that Pope *Adrian* placed it in a Church, which he had built in *Capracoro* [e]; but it was ſoon after removed from thence, and brought into *France*, by *Charlemagne*, as *Pamelius* aſſures us, upon the Authority of a ſmall Life of St. *Cyprian*, written, as he ſuppoſes, by *Paulus Diaconus* [f] (B).

Euſebius obſerves, that, in the Time of *Cornelius*, the Church of *Rome* was in a moſt flouriſhing Condition; for, not to mention the People, who were almoſt without Number, it conſiſted of 46 Preſbyters, 7 Subdeacons, 42 Acolytes, 52 Exorciſts, Lectors, and Janitors, or Door-keepers, and 1500 Widows, and other Poor, who were all maintained by the Alms and Offerings of the Faithful [g].

[c] Hier. vir. ill. c. 67. [d] Flor. p. 828, 830. [e] Anaſt. c. 46. p. 27. [f] Pamel. prolog. in S. Cyp. p. 19. [g] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 43.

Fourth Letter to *Fabius* have been tranſmitted to us by *Euſebius*. As for the Letter to *Lupicinus*, Biſhop of *Vienne*, which was found in the Archives of that Church, and publiſhed by Father *du Boſc*, the Cardinals *Baronius* (3) and *Bona* (4) think it genuine; but it is, without all Doubt, ſuppoſititious: for, according to *Ado* and *Baronius* himſelf (5), *Florentius*, whom *Lupicinus* is ſuppoſed to have ſucceeded, was raiſed to that See in the Reign of *Maximus*, or *Gordian*, about the Year 240. and held it till the Reign of *Valerian*, and about the Year 258. ſo that in 252. when *Cornelius* died, *Lupicinus* was not yet Biſhop. Beſides, in the Title of the Letter, which *Baronius* has ſuppreſſed, *Lupicinus* is ſtyled *Archbiſhop*; which Title was not known then, nor long after. The Letter is therefore rejected by *Launoy* (6), and Dr. *Pearſon* (7), as a forged and ſpurious Piece. *Eraſmus* aſcribes to *Cornelius* the Treatiſe on Charity (8); and *du Pin* both that, and the other on the public Shews, with the Diſcourſe againſt *Novatian* (9), which are all to be found among St. *Cyprian*'s Works.

(B) There is a famous Abbey, bearing his Name, at *Compiegne* in the Iſle of *France*, where his Reliques, and thoſe of St. *Cyprian*, are ſuppoſed to be kept in the ſame Shrine. But how can we reconcile this with what we read in the Council of *Reims*, held in 1049. under *Leo* IX. *viz.* that the Body of St. *Cornelius* was removed by the Clergy of *Compiegne*, from that City to *Reims*; and received there by the Pope (1)? But, on the other hand, the Council is contradicted by *Aubertus de Mira*, who aſſures us, that, in 860. the Reliques of Pope *Cornelius* were tranſlated from the Abbey of *Inde*, ſtanding about Four Miles South of *Aix la Chapelle*, to that of *Roſnay*, which is, at preſent, a Collegiate Church in *Flanders*, between *Oudenarde* and *Tournay*. In this Church is ſtill to be ſeen a Shrine, ſuppoſed to contain, as appears from the Inſcription, the Bones of St. *Cornelius* and St. *Cyprian* (2).

(3) Bar. ad ann. 255. n. 47. (4) Bona lit. l. 1. c. 3. p. 13. (5) Bar. ad ann. 262. n. 58. (6) Laun. Ger. l. 4. c. 6. (7) Pearſ. Cyp. ann. p. 37. (8) Eraſ. Cyp. p. 417. (9) Du Pin, t. 1. p. 469. (1) Conc. t. 9. p. 1033, 1042. (2) Vide Bolland. 12 Feb. p. 607. et Pamel. p. 23.

LUCIUS,

GALLUS, # LUCIUS, VOLUSIANUS.

Twenty-first BISHOP *of* Rome.

LUCIUS was no ſooner named to ſucceed *Cornelius*, than he was apprehended, and ſent, with many others, into Baniſhment; for St. *Cyprian* wrote him a Letter, in the Name of his Collegues, and his own, congratulating him, at the ſame time, on his Promotion, and his Exile, as appears from St. *Cyprian*'s Second Letter to him [h]; for his Firſt has not reached our Times. *Lucius* had been but a very ſhort time in Baniſhment, when he was recalled, to the inexpreſſible Joy of his Flock, who, it ſeems, crouded out to meet him [i]. On this Occaſion St. *Cyprian* wrote him a Second Letter, ſtill extant [k], wherein he teſtifies the Joy with which the News of his Return had been received by him, and his Brethren in *Africa*. He returned to *Rome* during the Heat of the Perſecution; but what occaſioned his Return we are no-where told. St. *Cyprian* ſays, in his Second Letter to him, that he was perhaps recalled to be immolated in the Sight of his Flock, that they might be animated and encouraged by the Example of his Chriſtian Conſtancy and Reſolution [l]; which happened accordingly; for he had not governed Eight whole Months, ſays *Euſebius* [m], no, nor Six, according to the moſt probable Opinion, but only Five, and a few Days, when he died a Martyr; for that Title is given him by St. *Cyprian* [n]. He was beheaded, ſay the Martyrologies; but on this Point the Antients are ſilent; and his dying in Priſon had given him a juſt Claim to that Title. His Body is ſuppoſed to have been diſcovered intire, in the Church of St. *Cæcilia* at *Rome*, in 1599. though the Church of *Roskild*, in the Iſle of *Zeland*, had long before pretended to his Head [o].

Year of Chriſt 252. *He is baniſhed.*

Returns to Rome.

and dies a Martyr.

[h] Cypr. ep. 58. [i] Idem ib. [k] Idem ep. 58. [l] Idem ib. [m] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 2. [n] Cyp. ep. 67. [o] Bolland. 4. Mart. p. 301, 302.

STEPHEN,

STEPHEN,

Twenty-second BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 253.

The Biſhops of Gaul *write to* Stephen.

STEPHEN, who ſucceeded *Lucius*, in 253. ſoon after his Election, received a Letter from *Fauſtinus*, Biſhop of *Lions*, written in the Name of all his Collegues in *Gaul*, informing him, that *Marcian*, Biſhop of *Arles*, having embraced the Doctrine of *Novatian*, had denied the Communion of the Church to the Lapſed, even at the Point of Death. At the ſame time they wrote to St. *Cyprian*, and on the ſame Subject [a], not caring to come to any vigorous Reſolution againſt their Collegue, without the Advice and Approbation of other Biſhops, eſpecially of *Rome* and *Carthage*; the former being eminent for the Dignity of his See, and the latter for his known Zeal, Piety, and Learning. But *Fauſtinus* did not find in the Biſhop of *Rome* the Zeal he expected; and therefore he wrote a ſecond Letter to St. *Cyprian*, exhorting him to animate the others by his Example [b]; which that zealous Prelate did accordingly: for he wrote immediately to *Stephen*, preſſing him to diſpatch, without Delay, full and ample Letters to the Biſhops of *Gaul*; that, finding themſelves thus backed and ſupported, they might thereby be encouraged to depoſe *Marcian*, and name another in his room. It is not to be doubted but the Biſhop of *Carthage*, who had the Welfare of the Church, at leaſt, as much at Heart as the Biſhop of *Rome*, did himſelf what he encouraged the others to do; but I cannot poſitively affirm it, ſince his Anſwer to *Fauſtinus* is loſt. As to the Iſſue of this Affair, the Antients have left us quite in the Dark (A).

St. *Cyprian* did not doubt in the leaſt but that *Marcian* would be depoſed; for, in his Letter to *Stephen*, he deſires him to let him know the Name of the Perſon who ſhould be choſen in his room, that he may not be at a Loſs, to whom he ſhould direct his Letters, and his Brethren [c].

[a] Cypr. ep. 67. [b] Idem ib. [c] Idem ib.

(A) *Marcian*'s Name is not in the Liſt of the Biſhops of *Arles*, publiſhed by *F. Mabillon*: whence ſome modern Writers have concluded, that he was actually depoſed; but that Liſt is very imperfect, the Names of many Biſhops being wanting there, whom we certainly know to have governed that Church.

Fauſtinus, and the other Biſhops of *Gaul*, did not apply, on this Occaſion, to *Stephen* alone, but to him, and to St. *Cyprian*. Why then ſhould their applying to the Biſhop of *Rome* be conſtrued, as it is, by all the Roman Catholic Writers, into a tacit Acknowlegement of his univerſal Juriſdiction, and not the like Conſtruction be put on their applying to the Biſhop of *Carthage?* But, in Truth, neither can bear ſuch a Conſtruction, ſince the Biſhops of *Gaul* did not refer the Cauſe of *Marcian* either to *Stephen*, or to St. *Cyprian:* they wrote to both only for their Advice and Approbation. *Stephen* was backward, for Reaſons unknown to us, in giving his; and therefore St. *Cyprian*, in a Letter, which he wrote on this Occaſion, preſſed him to encourage with his Letters the People of *Arles*, and the Biſhops of *Gaul*, to depoſe *Marcian*, and appoint another in his room [d]. Was not this plainly acknowleging, not in the Biſhop of *Rome*, but in the People and Clergy, the Power of depoſing one Biſhop, and appointing another in his room?

Stephen's raſh Conduct.

But to return to *Stephen:* His raſh Conduct had involved the Churches of *Spain* in endleſs Calamities, had not St. *Cyprian*, and the other Biſhops of *Africa*, zealouſly interpoſed. The Biſhops of *Spain*, having judged Two of their Collegues unworthy of the Epiſcopacy, *viz. Baſilides* of *Leon* and *Aſtorga*, and *Martial* of *Merida*, had diſpoſed of their Sees to others, appointing *Sabinus* in the room of the former, and *Felix* in that of the latter. They were both *Libellatici*, and guilty of many other Crimes, for which *Martial* had been depoſed; but *Baſilides*, returning to himſelf, and conſcious of his own Guilt, had voluntarily reſigned, declaring he ſhould think it a great Happineſs to be re-admitted, after due Satisfaction, to the Communion of the Church, even in the Capacity of a Layman. But, Ambition getting the better of all his good Reſolutions, he ſoon began to pant after his former Condition; and, thinking the Favour and Intereſt of the Biſhop of *Rome* might greatly contribute to his Re-eſtabliſhment, he undertook a Journey to that City; and there, as St. *Cyprian* expreſſes himſelf, *impoſed upon our Collegue* Stephen, *who lived at a great Diſtance, and was ignorant of the Truth, ſeeking unjuſtly to be reſtored to his Biſhoprick, from which he had been juſtly depoſed* [e]. Being thus admitted to the Communion of the Biſhop of *Rome*, he returned well ſatisfied to *Spain*, and there exerciſed all epiſcopal Functions, as he had formerly done. St. *Cyprian* does

He ſuffers himſelf to be impoſed upon.

[d] Cypr. ep. 70. [e] Cypr. ep. 68.

not

not tell us, in expreſs Terms, that *Martial* too had Recourſe to *Rome*; but that he had, may, perhaps, be gathered from his Words; for he writes, that, notwithſtanding the Craft and Deceit *Martial* had uſed, probably in impoſing upon *Stephen*, he had not been able to preſerve his Epiſcopacy [f]. Beſides, he acted as a Biſhop after he had been depoſed by a Synod; which he would have hardly attempted, had he not been countenanced by ſome Biſhop of Rank and Dignity. Be that as it will, the Churches of *Leon*, *Aſtorga*, and *Merida*, applied, in this their Diſtreſs, to the Biſhops of *Africa*, imploring, both by Letters and Deputies, their Advice and Aſſiſtance. The Deputies were the Two new Biſhops *Felix* and *Sabinus*; and their Deputation was backed by a preſſing Letter from *Felix*, Biſhop of *Saragoſa*, whom St. *Cyprian* ſtyles a Propagator of the Faith, and Defender of the Truth [g]. Theſe Letters being read at *Carthage*, in a Council of 28 Biſhops, with St. *Cyprian* at their Head, it was concluded, that *Baſilides* and *Martial* ought not to be acknowleged as Biſhops; that it was not lawful to communicate with them; that ſuch Biſhops as did, ought to be excommunicated themſelves; and, finally, that their impoſing upon *Stephen*, inſtead of giving them any kind of Right to the Sees they had forfeited by their Wickedneſs, added to their Guilt. By the ſame Council, the Election of *Sabinus* and *Felix* was confirmed, and they acknowleged by all the *African* Biſhops as their Collegues [h].

Martial of Merida excommunicated by the Biſhops of Africa, tho' admitted by Stephen to his Communion.

It is ſurpriſing, that *Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, *Davidius*, and other Advocates for the Pope's Supremacy, ſhould lay ſo much Streſs as they do, on the Recourſe to *Rome* of the Two depoſed Biſhops. If their recurring, or appealing, as they are pleaſed to ſtyle it, to the Biſhop of *Rome*, is any Proof of his being acknowleged by them for the Head of the Church, the Appeal of the other Biſhops of *Spain* from him to St. *Cyprian*, and their acquieſcing to his, and not to the Judgment of *Stephen*, will be a ſtronger Proof of St. *Cyprian*'s being acknowleged by them for the Head of the Church. Had *Baſilides* and *Martial* recurred not to *Rome*, but to *Carthage*, had the Biſhops of *Spain* appealed from St. *Cyprian* to *Stephen*, as they did from *Stephen* to St. *Cyprian*, and acquieſced to his Judgment, no Notice had been taken of the Appeal of the Two Apoſtates; that only of the Catholic Biſhops had been ſet forth with great Pomp and Flouriſh of

Appeals to Rome, no Proof of the Pope's Supremacy.

[f] Idem ib. [g] Idem ib. [h] Idem ib.

Words.

Words. But, as the Caſe ſtands, they muſt be ſatisfied with the Evidence of the Apoſtates, and leave the Catholic Biſhops to bear Teſtimony for us, which we ſhall not miſuſe; we ſhall not build upon it the Supremacy of the Church of *Carthage*; we ſhall not ſet up St. *Cyprian* for a Judge, to whoſe Tribunal all Appeals muſt be brought; in ſhort, we ſhall not make him an univerſal Judge, an univerſal Paſtor, a Pope; though, to the Teſtimony of the *Spaniſh* Biſhops, that of *Gregory Nazianzene* ſhould be added, and I defy the Champions for the See of *Rome* to allege one in their Favour more plain and expreſſive: *St.* Cyprian, ſays he, *preſided not only over the Church of* Carthage, *or that of* Africa, *on which he reflected an extraordinary Luſtre, but over all the Weſt, nay, and over all the Nations of the Eaſt, of the North, and the South* [i]. Had *Gregory* ſaid as much of the Biſhop of *Rome*, the Paſſage had been employ'd as a Corner-ſtone to ſupport the Pope's univerſal Juriſdiction.

The famous Diſpute about the Baptiſm of Heretics.

Not long after the Affair of the *Spaniſh* Biſhops, that is, about the Year 256. according to the moſt probable Opinion, happened the famous Conteſt about the Baptiſm of Heretics, which rent the whole Church into Two Parties, the one headed by St. *Cyprian*, and the other by *Stephen*. St. *Cyprian* maintained, that Baptiſm, adminiſtred by Heretics, was null and invalid; and, conſequently, that ſuch as came over from them, from what Sect ſoever they came, ought to be baptized by a Catholic Miniſter: he owned there was but one Baptiſm, and therefore avoided the Word *Rebaptization*; but thought that Heretics had not the Power of conferring it. On the other hand, *Stephen*, and thoſe who adhered to him, pretended, that Baptiſm conferred by Heretics, of whatever Sect or Perſuaſion, was valid; ſo that by avoiding one Error they fell into another; for ſome Heretics of thoſe Times, namely, the *Montaniſts* and *Marcionites*, did not baptize, as is commanded by the Goſpel, in the Name of the Three Perſons; whence their Baptiſm was declared null by Two œcumenical Councils, as I ſhall relate hereafter. I know great Pains have been taken to excuſe *Stephen*; but his own Words, quoted by St. *Cyprian*, from his own Letter to him, can, in my Opinion, admit of no Diſpute; for he there forbids, in expreſs Terms, the Baptizing of Heretics, *from what Hereſy ſoever they ſhould come* [k]. And here we may obſerve, by the way, that the whole Church erred,

Both Opinions erroneous.

[i] Greg. Naz. orat. 18. p. 281. [k] Cyp. ep. 70, 73.

either at this Time, or afterwards; for afterwards both Opinions were condemned, and both were held at this Time, by the one or the other of the Two Parties, into which the whole Church was divided. The Point in Diſpute had been canvaſſed long before, and differently ſettled in different Provinces. The Churches of *Africa* and *Numidia* had formerly admitted Heretics, without baptizing, or rebaptizing them; but the contrary Practice was eſtabliſhed in a Council of the Biſhops of theſe Two Provinces, ſummoned about the Cloſe of the Second Century, by *Agrippinus* Biſhop of *Carthage* [l]. The ſame Practice of baptizing Heretics was followed by the Churches of *Cappadocia*, and the other Provinces of *Aſia*, as a Tradition handed down to them from the Apoſtles Times; whence it was confirmed in a Council, which was held at *Iconium* in *Phrygia*, about the Year 230. and conſiſted of all the Biſhops of *Cappadocia*, *Galatia*, *Cilicia*, and the neighbouring Provinces [m]. The ſame Practice was approved of by another Council, aſſembled, much about the ſame time, at *Synnades* in *Phrygia* [n]. The Biſhops of *Pontus* and *Egypt* agreed, it ſeems, with thoſe of *Cappadocia* and *Galatia* [o]; but all the other Biſhops, eſpecially thoſe of *Italy*, *Gaul*, and *Spain*, held the contrary Opinion, and followed the oppoſite Practice. This Diſagreement, both in Opinion and Practice, had hitherto created no Diſturbance in the Church, each Biſhop conforming to the Cuſtom of his particular Church, as received by Tradition, or ſettled by Synods, without cenſuring thoſe who diſagreed with him, or being cenſured by them. But the Queſtion was now revived by Eighteen Biſhops of *Numidia*, who wrote to a Council, held at this time by St. *Cyprian*, to know whether they had done well in rebaptizing Heretics, agreeably to the antient Practice of their reſpective Churches. What raiſed this Doubt now we know not; but it is certain, the Council anſwered, that they ought to follow the Practice which they had hitherto obſerved [p]. The ſame Anſwer was returned by St. *Cyprian*, to *Quintus* Biſhop of *Mauritania*, who had asked the ſame Queſtion [q]. Soon after, another Council was held at *Carthage*, compoſed of 71 Biſhops, wherein the Decrees of the former Council, concerning the Baptiſm of Heretics, were confirmed; and beſides, it was ordained, that ſuch Presbyters and Deacons as had received Ordination at the Hands of Heretics, or, after receiving Orders in the Church, had fallen into

The Cuſtom of baptizing Heretics practiſed by ſeveral Churches, and eſtabliſhed by Councils.

It is confirmed by Two Councils, held by St. Cyprian;

[l] Cyp. ep. 70, 73. Aug. bapt. l. 2. c. 7. et 8. [m] Cyp. ep. 75. [n] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 7. [o] Baſil. ep. 75. [p] Cyp. ep. 70. [q] Idem ep. 71.

Hereſy,

Hereſy, ſhould be admitted to Communion only as Laymen [r]. The Council, by a ſynodal Letter, acquainted *Stephen* with theſe Reſolutions, hoping he would approve and embrace them; but, at the ſame time declaring, that, if any Biſhop ſhould think fit to reject them, and follow different Opinions, agreeably to the Liberty they all claimed, no Breach of Peace and Unity ſhould thence follow on their Side [s]. With this Letter St. *Cyprian* ſent thoſe he had wrote to *Quintus*, and to the Biſhops of *Numidia* [t].

who acquaints Stephen with their Decrees.

It was after this Council, and before *Stephen*'s Anſwer, that St. *Cyprian* wrote the famous Letter to *Jubaianus*, who was a Biſhop; but in what Province, or of what City, we know not. *Jubaianus* had, by a Letter, asked St. *Cyprian*'s Opinion about the Baptizing of Heretics; and, at the ſame time, ſent him the Copy of a Letter, which he had received; wherein many Reaſons were alleged to prove, that Baptiſm, by whomſoever adminiſtred, not even the *Marcionites* excepted, ought to be deemed valid. The Author of this Letter inveighs bitterly againſt St. *Cyprian*, and thoſe of his Party, ſtyling them Betrayers of the Truth, and Enemies to the Peace and Unity of the Church [u]. *Baronius*, and likewiſe *Pamelius*, aſcribe that Piece to *Stephen*, not appriſed that they muſt conſequently own the Doctrine held by *Stephen* to have been no leſs erroneous than that which was held by St. *Cyprian*, if the Doctrine of the Church be true, as I have obſerved above. But we have not ſufficient Grounds to ſuppoſe *Stephen* the Author of it, ſince many beſides him wrote in favour of that Opinion. St. *Cyprian*, in Anſwer to *Jubaianus*, ſent him his Letter to *Quintus*, that of the firſt Council to the Biſhops of *Numidia*; and, moreover, wrote him a long Letter, with a great many Arguments in favour of his Opinion, and the Anſwers to what was objected againſt it, eſpecially in the Letter, whereof *Jubaianus* had tranſmitted him a Copy [w]. He ends his Letter by a moſt ſolemn Proteſtation of Unity and Charity with thoſe who ſhould differ from him; which is related at Length by St. *Jerom* [x], and likewiſe by St. *Auſtin*, who tells us, that he was never tired with reading over and over again thoſe Words of Peace and Charity, breathing nothing but the ſweeteſt Odour of that Union, in which the holy Prelate anxiouſly ſought to live with his Brethren [a]. To this Letter *Jubaianus* returned Anſwer, that he had fully convinced him, and that

St. Cyprian's famous Letter to Jubaianus.

His Deſire to live in Peace and Unity with thoſe who held the oppoſite Opinion.

[r] Idem ep. 73. [s] Idem ep. 72. [t] Idem ib. [u] Idem ep. 73. [w] Idem ib.
[x] Hier. in Luci. c. 9. [a] Aug. bapt. l. 4. c. 8.

he willingly embraced his Opinion [b]. In that Letter St. *Cyprian* seems to have muſtered all the Arguments that could be alleged in favour of his Opinion; and therefore St. *Auſtin* has employed his Third, Fourth, and Fifth Books on Baptiſm, in confuting them.

We have hitherto ſeen with how much Temper, Moderation, and Candor, the Diſpute was managed on St. *Cyprian*'s Side: he determined nothing without the Advice and Approbation of his Collegues aſſembled in Council; the Determinations of the Council he imparted to other Biſhops, leaving them at full Liberty to embrace or reject them, and declaring, that no Diſagreement in Opinion ſhould occaſion in him the leaſt Breach of Charity. How different was the Conduct of the Biſhop of *Rome!* He condeſcended, indeed, to anſwer the ſynodal Letter of the *African* Biſhops; but did it with that Pride and Arrogance, that, in After-ages, became the Characteriſtic of his Succeſſors. He begins with the Dignity of his See, and his pretended Succeſſion to St. *Peter*, which he takes care to put them in mind of: in the next Place, he rejects their Decrees with the utmoſt Indignation, and attempts to confute the Arguments alleged to ſupport them: he then proceeds to Commands and Menaces, ordering St. *Cyprian* to quit his Opinion, and threatening to cut off, from the Communion of the Church, all thoſe who ſhould preſume to differ from him, and rebaptize Heretics: he concludes his Letter with a bitter Invective againſt St. *Cyprian*, branding that great Luminary of the Church with the reproachful Names of *falſe Chriſt*, *falſe Apoſtle*, *deceitful Workman* [c]. Such was Pope *Stephen*'s Anſwer to a moſt reſpectful Letter from a Council of 71 Biſhops. *Pompeius*, Biſhop of *Sabrata* in the *Tripolitana*, hearing of this Letter, and being deſirous to peruſe it, as he had done all the reſt, on the ſame Subject, St. *Cyprian*, in Compliance with his Deſire, ſent him a Copy of it; and at the ſame time wrote him a Letter, wherein he treats *Stephen*, upon the juſt Provocation he had given him, with more than ordinary Sharpneſs and Acrimony, charging him with *Pride and Impertinence*, with *Self-contradiction and Ignorance*, with *Indiſcretion*, *Obſtinacy*, *Childiſhneſs*; nay, he ſtyles him a *Favourer and Abettor of Heretics againſt the Church of God* [d]. St. *Cyprian* was more provoked at *Stephen*'s abuſive Language, than moved either by his Authority or Menaces. St. *Auſtin* ſuppoſes the Opinion he held

Stephen's *Pride and Arrogance.*

He is ſeverely cenſured by St. Cyprian.

[b] Concil. p. 397. [c] Cyp. ep. 74. Euſeb. l. 7. c. 3. Aug. bapt. l. 2. c. 7. [d] Cyp. ep. 74.

to

to have been falſe and erroneous; and yet owns, that he was not obliged to yield to the Authority of *Stephen*, nor give up the Point, till he was convinced by dint of Reaſon, or by the Deciſion of an œcumenical Council [e]. However, as St. *Cyprian* ſought nothing but Truth, upon the Receipt of *Stephen*'s Letter, he ſummoned a great Council, in order to have the Queſtion canvaſſed anew, and examined with more Care and Attention. The Council met accordingly, on the Firſt of *September* 256. conſiſting of 85 Biſhops, a great Number of Presbyters and Deacons, and a conſiderable Part of the People [f]. To this Aſſembly were read the Letter of *Jubaianus* to St. *Cyprian*, his Anſwer to it, and *Jubaianus*'s Reply; with the Letter of the former Council to *Stephen*, and *Stephen*'s Anſwer to the Council. Theſe Pieces being read, St. *Cyprian* made a ſhort Diſcourſe, exhorting his Collegues to ſpeak their Mind freely: the Words he uſed on this Occaſion alluded, without Doubt, to the Pride and Arrogance of the Biſhop of *Rome*; *Let none of us*, ſays he, *ſet up for the Biſhop of Biſhops, let none of us preſume to reduce our Collegues by a tyrannical Fear to the Neceſſity of obeying*: he concluded with proteſting anew, in the moſt ſolemn manner, that he left every one the full Liberty of following what Opinion he liked beſt; and that no Man ſhould, on that ſcore, be judged by him, or ſeparated from his Communion [g]. The Diſcourſe being finiſhed, each Biſhop delivered his Opinion, and St. *Cyprian* the laſt, all approving, with one Conſent, the Baptizing of Heretics. *Pamelius* and others count 87 Biſhops preſent at the Council, becauſe *Natalis* of *Oea* ſpoke for the Two other Biſhops of *Libya Tripolitana*, viz. *Pompeius* of *Sabrata*, and *Dioga* of *Leptis the great* [h], who were abſent.

St. Cyprian *aſſembles a great Council at* Carthage;

which confirms the antient Practice.

The Third Council of *Carthage* having thus confirmed the Decrees of the Two former, notwithſtanding the Threats and Menaces of the Biſhop of *Rome*, it was thought adviſable, for the Peace of the Church, to acquaint him therewith; and, at the ſame time, to inform him more particularly of the Reaſons, on which their Opinion was grounded. Deputies were accordingly diſpatched to *Rome* for that Purpoſe; but *Stephen* not only refuſed to ſee or hear them, but would not allow any of his Flock to correſpond with them, to ſupply them with the Neceſſaries of Life, or even to admit them under the ſame Roof; excluding them not only from his Communion,

Deputies ſent to Stephen, *how treated.*

[e] Aug. de bapt. l. 1. c. 7. 18. & l. 2. c. 8. 15. Aug. de bapt. l. 3. c. 3. [f] Cyp. con. p. 397. [g] Idem ib. [h] Cyp. conc. p. 403.

but

but from common Hospitality, says *Firmilian*, who wrote this very Years [i]. He did not stop here; but, transported with Rage, or Zeal, as *Baronius* is pleased to style it, he cut off from his Communion all the Bishops, who had assisted at the Council, and all those who held the same Opinion, that is, the Bishops of *Africa*, *Numidia*, *Mauritania*, *Cilicia*, *Cappadocia*, *Galatia*, and *Egypt* [k]. But *Stephen*'s Anathemas proved as those of *Victor*'s had done before, *bruta fulmina*; no Regard was had to them, no, not even by those of his own Party; who, by continuing in Communion with those whom he had cut off from his, sufficiently declared their Thoughts touching his rash and unchristian Conduct. This Dispute, says St. *Austin*, occasioned no Schism in the Church, the Bishops continuing united in Charity, notwithstanding their Disagreement in Opinion [l]. No Thanks to *Stephen*, who did all that lay in his Power to set the Bishops at Variance, and involve the whole Church in Confusion and Disorder: *The Peace of Christ*, continues St. *Austin*, *triumphed in their Hearts, and put a Stop to the growing Schism*; not in the Heart of *Stephen*, where Rage, Ambition, and Envy lodged; Guests incompatible with Peace and Charity, but in the Hearts of the other Bishops, who were thereby restrained from following his Example. How many Schisms had been prevented, had Bishops in After-ages trod in the Footsteps of those great Prelates!

He excommunicates all who held the opposite Opinion.

Dionysius, afterwards Pope, and *Philemon*, both then Presbyters of the Church of *Rome*, acquainted, no doubt, by *Stephen*'s Direction, the great *Dionysius*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, with what had passed, hoping to gain him over to their Party, and extort from him an Approbation of *Stephen*'s Conduct: but that illustrious Prelate, foreseeing, and well weighing, the evil Consequences that might attend it, declared his Sentiments with all the Freedom and Zeal that became a Man of his Rank in the Church. He told them plainly, that the condemning a Practice, which had been established by so many Councils, was what he could by no means approve of; that an Affair of such Consequence required long and mature Deliberation; and that the deciding it over-hastily might raise eternal Disputes, and end at last in a Schism: he therefore begged *Stephen*, in a Letter, which he wrote to him on this Occasion, that he would, upon Reflection, alter his Conduct; and, in an Affair upon which so much depended, take different Measures from those which he had hitherto pursued [m]. As

Stephen's *Conduct disapproved by* Dionysius *of* Alexandria;

[i] Cyp. ep. 75. [k] Euseb. l. 7. c. 5. [l] Aug. bapt. l. 5. c. 25. [m] Euseb. l. 7. c. 5.

Stephen wrote to *Dionyſius*, ſo did St. *Cyprian* to *Firmilian*, giving him a particular and candid Account both of *Stephen*'s Conduct and his own. *Firmilian* was Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, and one of the moſt eminent Prelates at that Time in the Church both for Piety and Learning: he had a ſingular Veneration for St. *Cyprian*, maintained with great Zeal the ſame Cauſe, and conſequently had been equally ill uſed and excommunicated by *Stephen*. He therefore received with extraordinary Joy the Letter, which St. *Cyprian* ſent him by *Rogatian* one of his Deacons, often read it with great Satisfaction [n], and anſwered it with a long Letter [o], which is ſtill extant, though St. *Cyprian*'s to him has been loſt long ſince. In this Letter *Firmilian*, amazed and provoked at *Stephen*'s unaccountable Conduct, expreſſes his Deteſtation of it in ſharper Terms than the Laws of Charity can well allow; for, not content to charge him with ſacrificing the Peace of the Church to a petulant Humour, he compares him to *Judas*, and ſtigmatizes him with the Epithets of inhuman, audacious, inſolent, wicked, impious Schiſmatic; for *he is a true Schiſmatic*, ſays *Firmilian*, *who departs from the Unity of the Church, which thou haſt done*, O Stephen; *for, by attempting to ſeparate others from thee, thou haſt ſeparated thyſelf from all other Churches! How much Sin haſt thou heaped upon thyſelf by cutting thyſelf off from ſo many Flocks* [p]! *Firmilian*'s Letter was tranſlated into *Latin* by St. *Cyprian* himſelf, as is manifeſt from the Style. It was unknown, it ſeems, to St. *Auſtin*; for he never quotes it, nor, in confuting the Opinion of St. *Cyprian*, takes any notice of ſome Reaſons alleged in that Letter to ſupport it.

and ſeverely cenſured by Firmilian.

There was no Hope of ſeeing an End put to this Diſpute, ſo long as *Stephen* lived; but he dying, his Succeſſor, who was a Man of a quite different Temper, laid the Storm, which his furious and ungovernable Paſſion had raiſed. He died on the 2d of *Auguſt* 257. according to the mōſt probable Opinion [q]. The Church of *Rome*, upon the Authority of his Acts, ranks him among the Martyrs; but that Honour is not paid him either by St. *Auſtin*, or by *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, who, naming him together with St. *Cyprian*, as they often do, give conſtantly the Title of Martyr to the latter, and never to the former. As for his Acts, they flatly contradict, in ſeveral Points, the moſt unexceptionable Writers among the Antients [r], and therefore by no means

Stephen *dies, but not a Martyr.*

His Acts fabulous.

[n] Cyp. ep. 75. [o] Cyp. ib. [p] Id. ib. [q] Buch. cycl. p. 297.
[r] Pearſ. annal. Cyp. p. 57, 58.

deſerve

deſerve the Credit which *Baronius* would have us give them [s]. Even *Anaſtaſius* ſeems to have made no Account of them, if in his Time they were yet compoſed, which may be queſtioned; for the Account he gives us of *Stephen*'s Death differs widely from that which we read in thoſe Acts [t]. But he had made a bold Attempt towards extending the Power and Authority of the See of *Rome*, and therefore was to be placed among the Saints for the Encouragement of others. To ſay he had merited that Honour by his Virtues, either as a Chriſtian or a Biſhop, had been carrying the Impoſture too far: the only Means therefore left of making him a Saint, was to make him a Martyr, that, by his glorious Death, he might be thought to have deſerved what it was manifeſt from the Records of thoſe Times he had not deſerved by his Chriſtian Life. Hence Acts were forged, ſetting forth his heroic Confeſſion of the Faith before the Emperor, his Sufferings on that Account, the ſtupendous Miracles he wrought, *&c.* which, however incredible, might, in Proceſs of Time, by their Antiquity alone, gain Credit with the greater Part of Mankind. *Stephen* was buried in the
His Reliques. Cœmetery of *Calliſtus* [u]; whence his Body was tranſlated about the Year 762. by *Paul* I. to a Monaſtery of *Greek* Monks, which that Pope had built in *Rome*, as we read in *Anaſtaſius* [w]. How it got from thence to *Trani* in *Apulia* nobody knows; but from that City it was conveyed with great Pomp in 1682. to *Piſa* in *Tuſcany*, where it is ſtill worſhiped in a Church bearing the pretended Saint's Name [x]. According to the moſt probable Opinion, *Stephen* governed Four Years, and about Six Months.

VALERIAN, **SIXTUS II.** GALLIENUS.

Twenty-third BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 257. *STEPHEN* being dead, *Sixtus* or *Xyſtus* II. a Deacon of the Church of *Rome*, was choſen to ſucceed him. As the late Diſpute was not yet ended, *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* no ſooner heard of his Promotion, than he began to preſs him with great Earneſtneſs to relinquiſh the wild Pretenſions of his Predeceſſor, and concur with

Dionyſius *of* Alexandria *interpoſes in the famous Diſpute.*

[s] Bar. ad ann. 259. [t] Anaſt. in vit. Vict. [u] Buch. cycl. p. 267.
[w] Anaſt. c. 95. [x] Boll. Pont. p. 36.

the

the other Biſhops in reſtoring Peace and Tranquillity to the Church [y]. He wrote Three Letters to him on the ſame Subject, whereof the laſt was from *Dionyſius* and the whole Church of *Alexandria*, to *Sixtus* and the whole Church of *Rome* [z]. He wrote likewiſe to *Dionyſius* and *Philemon*, two Presbyters of the Church of *Rome*, whom we have mentioned above, and who upon *Stephen*'s Death ſeem to have abandoned his Party; for *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, in his firſt Letter to *Sixtus*, writes, That theſe two Presbyters had been formerly of *Stephen*'s Opinion [a], a plain Indication that they were not then. The Biſhop of *Alexandria* had at laſt the Satisfaction to ſee his pious Endeavours crowned with Succeſs; for we find no farther Mention made of this Diſpute till it was revived by the *Donatiſts*. In what Manner it ended we are no-where told; but it is manifeſt from the Writers of thoſe Times, that the *African* and *Aſiatic* Biſhops continued the ſame Practice of baptizing Heretics, till it was condemned by the two great Councils, of *Arles* in 314. and of *Nice* in 325 [b]. Whence we may well conclude, that the Terms propoſed at the Beginning of the Diſpute by *Dionyſius* and St. *Cyprian* were agreed to by *Sixtus*, *viz.* That no Reſtraint ſhould be laid on the Biſhops of either Side, but that every one ſhould be allowed to follow undiſturbed which of the two Opinions he thought moſt agreeable to the Scripture and to Reaſon. This was allowing the Biſhops to conſult the Scriptures, and make uſe of their own Reaſon, in a Point already judged and decided by the Biſhop of *Rome*. But the Succeſſors of *Sixtus* have not been ſo complaiſant; for they pretend, that a blind Faith ought to be yielded to all their Deciſions as infallibly true, a blind Obedience to all their Decrees as unqueſtionably holy.

Peace reſtored to the Church by his means.

But now the Perſecution, which had begun ſome Months before the Deceaſe of *Stephen*, raged with more Violence than ever: For *Valerian* having, at the Inſtigation of an *Egyptian* Magician, changed the Kindneſs he once had for the Chriſtians into an implacable Hatred, he ordered, by a Reſcript to the Senate, all Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, to be carefully ſought for, and executed without Mercy [c]. Purſuant to this Order, *Sixtus*, who among the firſt fell into the Hands of the Perſecutors, was immediately either beheaded, as we read in the Pontifical of *Bucherius* [d]; or crucified, as we are told by *Prudentius* [e];

Valerian *perſecutes the Church.*

Sixtus *martyred.*

[y] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 5, 9. [z] Idem, c. 9. [a] Idem, c. 5. [b] Cyp. ep. 77. Baſil. can. 47. & ep. 8. conc. Arel. can. 8. [c] Cyp. ep. 82. [d] Buch. p. 268. [e] Prud. de coron. martyr. p. 71.

having held the Chair only Eleven Months, and ſome Days. *Pontius*, a Deacon of the Church of *Carthage*, ſtyles him a good and *pacific Prelate*[f], no doubt on account of his Conduct quite oppoſite to that of his ambitious and quarrelſome Predeceſſor (A).

GALLIENUS **DIONYSIUS**, CLAUDIUS II.

Twenty-fourth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 258. *The See vacant almoſt a whole Year.*

SIXTUS being dead, and the Chriſtians prevented by the Perſecution from aſſembling to chooſe another in his room, the See remained vacant almoſt a whole Year, that is, from the 6th of *Auguſt* 258. to the 22d of *July* 259. when *Dionyſius*, a Presbyter of the Church of *Rome*, whom we have mentioned above, was elected, to the great Satisfaction of the Faithful; for he was one of the moſt eminent Men of his Time both for Piety and Learning[g]. During his Pontificate, the *Goths* broke into the Empire, over-ran all *Aſia Minor*, and, having almoſt utterly deſtroyed the City of *Cæſarea*, they carried with them into Captivity moſt of its Chriſtian Inhabitants. *Firmilian* was then Biſhop of the Place, who had cenſured the Conduct of *Stephen* with ſo much Sharpneſs and Acrimony; but the Remembrance of what had paſſed on that unhappy Occaſion had not that Effect on *Dionyſius*, which far leſs Provocations have had on many of his Succeſſors; for he no ſooner heard of the Diſtreſs that Church was in, than, laying hold of ſo favourable an Opportunity to exert his Charity, he wrote a

Dionyſius's *Charity to the diſtreſſed Chriſtians of* Cæſarea.

[f] Pont. in vit. St. Cyp. p. 8. [g] Baſil. ep. 220. & de Sp. Sanct. c. 29. Euſeb. l. 7. c. 7. Athan. de ſyn. ep. 918.

(A) *Ruffinus* publiſhed, under the Name of *Sixtus* Biſhop of *Rome*, the Book of a *Pythagorean* Philoſopher, named *Sixtus*. St. *Jerom* reproaches him in two Places with that *Impoſture*, as he ſtyles it, ſuppoſing him to have known the Work, which he aſcribed to Pope *Sixtus*, not to be his (1). St. *Auſtin* was impoſed upon among the reſt; for, in his Treatiſe of *Nature and Grace*, he quotes that Book as the Work of Pope *Sixtus*; but he afterwards owned and corrected his Miſtake (2). It was ranked by Pope *Gelaſius* among the Books of Heretics; ſo that he ſuppoſed it to have been written by a Chriſtian; which was more than he could know, there not being a ſingle Word in it whence we can argue the Author to have believed in, or to have had any Knowlege of Chriſt: and it is on this Conſideration that it has been thought unworthy of a Biſhop of thoſe times.

(1) Ep. ad Cteſiph. contr. Pelag. c. 22. & in cap. 18. Ezech. (2) Aug. l. 2. retract. c. 42.

Letter

Letter to comfort them in their Calamity, and at the ſame time diſpatched proper Perſons with large Collections to ranſom the Chriſtians who had fallen into the Hands of the *Barbarians* [h]. The Letter, which *Dionyſius* wrote on this Occaſion, was carefully kept in the Archives of the Church of *Cæſarea*, as an authentic Monument of his Goodneſs and Charity [i]. The great *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* having, at this Time, compoſed a learned Treatiſe to prove againſt *Sabellius* the Diſtinction of the Divine Perſons, ſome over-zealous Catholics, miſconſtruing ſeveral Paſſages in that Work, and concluding that he had run into the oppoſite Error, accuſed him to the Biſhop of *Rome*, as if he denied the Son to be conſubſtantial with the Father [k]. Hereupon the Biſhop of *Rome*, having aſſembled a Council, acquainted *Dionyſius* with the Sentiments of the other Biſhops, and his own, expreſſing his Concern that the Divinity of the Word ſhould have been queſtioned by him, and at the ſame time deſiring him to anſwer the Accuſation [l]. This *Dionyſius* readily did in Four Books, which he ſtyled *Confutation and Apology*; ſhewing therein that his Opinion was very different from what it had been repreſented at *Rome*, and explaining thoſe Paſſages which had given Ground for the Accuſation. This Work he addreſſed to the Biſhop of *Rome* [m]. Here *Baronius* exults. Behold, ſays he, one of the moſt eminent Prelates of the Church, upon Suſpicion of Hereſy, arraigned at *Rome*, judged at *Rome*. Who does not ſee a ſupreme Tribunal erected there, to which all Cauſes muſt be brought; a ſovereign Judge reſiding there, by whom all Perſons muſt be abſolved or condemned; is either blind and cannot ſee, or ſhuts his Eyes and will not ſee [n]. And does not the ſharp-ſighted Annaliſt himſelf ſee what every one the leaſt converſant in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory muſt ſee, if he is not either blind and cannot, or ſhuts his Eyes and will not ſee, *viz.* Biſhops, when guilty, or only ſuſpected of Hereſy, accuſed to ſome of their Collegues, who neither had nor claimed any Juriſdiction over them? Thus was the famous *Paul* of *Samoſata*, Biſhop of *Antioch*, at this very Time, accuſed by his whole Church, firſt to *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and ſoon after to *Firmilian* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* [o]. That ſuch an Indictment argued any Juriſdiction in thoſe Biſhops over the Biſhop of *Antioch*, is what *Baronius* himſelf dares not affirm; and yet a like

Dionyſius *of* Alexandria *accuſed at* Rome.

That argues no Juriſdiction in the Biſhop of Rome *over him.*

[h] Baſil. ib. [i] Idem ib. [k] Athan. pro ſent. Dion. Alex. p. 558. [l] Id. ib. & de ſyn. 918, 919. [m] Athan. ib. p. 558, 559. [n] Bar. ann. 263. n. 50. [o] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 27.

Indictment brought to *Rome* is enough for him to transform that See into a ſupreme Tribunal; that Biſhop, though far from ſuch ambitious Thoughts, into a ſovereign Judge. But the Biſhop of *Rome*, ſays *Baronius*, required of *Dionyſius* a Confeſſion or Declaration of his Faith: And does not that argue Superiority and Juriſdiction? *Baronius* himſelf knew it does not: for it is impoſſible he ſhould not know, that when a Biſhop was ſuſpected of Hereſy, all his Collegues had a Right to require of him a Confeſſion of his Faith, and not to communicate with him till they had received it.

Paul *Biſhop of* Antioch *condemned and depoſed*

In the Time of *Dionyſius* was held the famous Council of *Antioch*, which condemned and depoſed *Paul* Biſhop of that City, who denied the Diſtinction of the Divine Perſons, and the Divinity of *Chriſt*. Of the Depoſition of *Paul*, and the Election of *Damnus*, who was placed in his Room, notice was immediately given to the whole Church, by a Synodal Letter addreſſed to *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Rome*, and to *Maximus*, who had ſucceeded the great *Dionyſius* in the See of *Alexandria* P. And here it will not be foreign to my Purpoſe to obſerve, that the Biſhop of *Antioch* was ſummoned to appear before the Council, and not at the ſupreme Tribunal erected by *Baronius* at *Rome*; that he was condemned and depoſed without the Conſent or Concurrence, nay, and without the Knowlege of the ſovereign Judge reſiding at *Rome*; that he did not appeal to him, which he certainly would have done, as he was a Man of unparalleled Impudence and Ambition, had ſuch a Cuſtom obtained in thoſe Days; and laſtly, that the Fathers of the Council wrote to the Biſhop of *Rome* in the ſame Manner as they did to other Biſhops, letting him know, that for the future he was to communicate with *Damnus*, and not with *Paul*. All this is manifeſt from the Account which St. *Baſil* gives us of that Council q. And yet *Baronius* brings in that Father, even on this Occaſion, as an Evidence for the Papal Supremacy (A).

without the Conſent or Knowlege of the Biſhop of Rome.

From

P Idem, l. 7. c. 30.

q Baſil. de ſynod.

(A) For by wrong pointing a Paſſage in the *Latin* Tranſlation of that Author, he makes him contradict himſelf, and aſcribe the depoſing of *Paul* to *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Rome*, and the Great *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, though the latter was dead before *Paul* was depoſed, as is evident from the Letter which was written by the Council on that Occaſion, and is addreſſed to *Maximus* the Succeſſor of *Dionyſius* in the See of *Alexandria* (1). The Paſſage runs thus; *Duo enim* Dionyſii *diu ante eos ſeptuaginta fuere, qui* Samoſatenſem *ſuſtulere, quorum alter* Romæ, *alter* Alexandriæ *Præſul erat* (2). The Meaning of St. *Baſil* is, that the two *Dionyſius's* flouriſhed before the Council of *Antioch*, which conſiſted of Seventy Biſhops, and depoſed *Paul* of *Samoſata*; that is, before the Second Council that was aſſembled

(1) Euſeb. l. 7. c. 30. (2) Baſil. de ſyn. p. 918.

againſt

From St. *Baſil*, *Baronius* runs to the Emperor *Aurelian*, begging of a Pagan Prince what he could not extort from a Catholic Biſhop, a Declaration and Acknowlegement of the Pope's Supremacy. The Reader muſt know, that *Paul* having kept, by Force, Poſſeſſion of the Biſhop's Habitation in Defiance of the Council, the Catholic Biſhops had Recourſe to the Emperor, who after hearing both Parties with great Attention, adjudged the Houſe to him, who ſhould be acknowleged by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and the other Biſhops of *Italy* [r]. This *Baronius* interprets as an open Acknowlegement of the Pope's Supremacy; and that his Readers may not overlook it, as moſt of them would be apt to do, he takes care to beſpeak their Attention, by marking it in the Margin with the following Words in Capitals, *The Emperor* Aurelian *acknowleges the Supremacy of the Church of* Rome [s]. From this one would expect to find *Aurelian* not only turned Chriſtian, but proſtrate at his Holineſs's Feet, and bowing down to kiſs them: but our Annaliſt, to the great Diſappointment of his Readers, after having thus raiſed their Attention, only repeats out of *Euſebius* the Sentence pronounced by the Emperor, which he would have us ſuppoſe with him to have been owing to the Knowlege that Prince had of the Pope's Supremacy. And why muſt the Pope's Supremacy be brought in here rather than the Supremacy of the Biſhops of *Ravenna*, of *Milan*, of *Aquileia*, &c. and, above all, the Supremacy of the collective Body of the *Italian* Biſhops? for to them, and not to any particular Biſhop, the Cauſe was referred by the Emperor. As for the Emperor's Conduct on this Occaſion, it may be thus accounted for: That juſt and wiſe Prince obſerved the Biſhops in the Eaſt greatly animated againſt *Paul*; and therefore apprehending them more ſway'd

Paul keeps Poſſeſſion of the Biſhop's Habitation.

The Emperor's Sentence whether favourable to the Pretenſions of the See of Rome.

[r] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 24. [s] Bar. ad ann. 272. n. 18.

againſt him; for another had been convened in the ſame City about eight Years before to depoſe him; but upon his pretending to renounce his Errors, the Sentence had been ſuſpended. The above-quoted Paſſage *Baronius* ſtops thus; *Duo enim* Dionyſii *diu ante eos ſeptuaginta fuere*; *qui* Samoſatenſem *depoſuere*, &c. ſ that the Relative *qui* refers, according to this Method of Pointing, to the two *Dionyſius's*, and not to the Seventy Biſhops: as if St. *Baſil* had ſaid, *The two* Dionyſius's, *who depoſed* Paul *of* Samoſata, *flouriſhed before the Council of* Antioch, *which was compoſed of Seventy Biſhops* (3). So that *Paul* muſt be twice depoſed, St. *Baſil* muſt contradict himſelf, all the Writers of thoſe times muſt be arraigned as guilty of an unpardonable Omiſſion, leſt the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhould appear to have been, what he really was, an idle Spectator of a Tranſaction ſo famous in the Hiſtory of the Church. A Writer of any Honour or Honeſty had rather give up a Cauſe, than expoſe himſelf thus by attempting to defend it.

(3) Bar. ad ann. 265. n. 10.

by

by Paſſion and Prejudice than by Juſtice and Equity, he referred the Cauſe to the Biſhops of *Italy*, who he thought would judge more impartially, as being placed at a Diſtance, and not engaged, at leaſt not ſo warmly, in the Diſpute [t]. But this happened two Years after the Death of *Dionyſius*; for he died on the 26th of *December* 269. *Claudius* and *Paternus* being Conſuls, after having governed the Church of *Rome* for the Space of Ten Years, Five Months, and Four Days, according to the moſt probable Opinion [u]. As he died in the Reign of *Claudius* II. ſurnamed *the Gothic*, who is repreſented in the Acts of ſome pretended Martyrs as an implacable Enemy to the Chriſtian Name, he is in ſome Martyrologies honoured with the Title of Martyr; but as neither *Euſebius*, nor any other antient Writer, takes notice of that Prince's having ever perſecuted or moleſted the Chriſtians, thoſe Acts ought to be looked upon as fabulous, and *Dionyſius* with 375 more expunged out of the Catalogue of Martyrs; though ſome of them, namely *Marcus*, *Priſcus*, *Valentine*, and *Quirinus*, are honoured by the Church of *Rome*, as Saints of the firſt Claſs, and have filled with their Reliques moſt of the Provinces of *Europe*.

Dionyſius *dies*,

not a Martyr.

CLAUDIUS II. **FELIX,** AURELIAN.

Twenty-fifth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 269.

DIONYSIUS was ſucceeded by *Felix*, in whoſe time a furious Perſecution being raiſed by *Aurelian*, he may be ſuppoſed to have ſuffered among the reſt, ſince he is diſtinguiſhed by the Council of *Epheſus* [a], by St. *Cyril* [b], and by *Vincentius Lirinenſis* [c], with the Title of Martyr. He preſided, according to *Euſebius* [d], *Syncellus* [e], and *Eutychius* [f], Five Years, to which *Baronius* adds Eleven Months, and Twenty-five Days [g]. He wrote a Letter addreſſed to *Maximus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, which is quoted by *Cyril*, and the Council of *Epheſus* [h]. The Acts of the Martyrs, who are ſuppoſed to have ſuffered under *Aurelian*, are without all doubt ſuppoſititious; for in

Felix *dies a Martyr in the Perſecution of* Aurelian.

[t] Vide Du Pin de antiq. ecc. diſcip. diſſert. 2. p. 156. [u] Buch. p. 272.
[a] Conc. t. 3. p. 511. [b] Cyr. ib. [c] Vin. Lirin. c. 42. [d] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 32.
[e] Sync. p. 385. [f] Eutych. p. 400. [g] Buch. 272. [h] Conc. t. 3. p. 511, 851.

them frequent Mention is made of the Emperor's Son, whereas the Writers of thoſe times tell us in expreſs Terms, that he had a Daughter, but no Male Iſſue [i].

AURELIAN, TACITUS,

EUTYCHIANUS,

PROBUS, CARUS.

Twenty-ſixth BISHOP *of* Rome.

FELIX being dead, *Eutychianus* was choſen in his room in the very Beginning of the Year 275 [k]. Several Things are ſaid of him by *Anaſtaſius*, and other Writers of no Authority; but all I can learn of the Antients concerning him is, that he governed Eight Years, and Eleven Months [l]; and conſequently died in the Cloſe of the Year 283. He is honoured by the Church of *Rome* as a Martyr, and ſaid in the *Roman* Martyrology to have ſuffered under *Numerian*; but it is certain that in 283. when *Eutychianus* died, *Numerian* was not Emperor, but only *Cæſar*, and at that very time engaged with his Father *Carus* in a War with the *Perſians* in the Eaſt, where he was aſſaſſinated by *Aper* his Father-in-Law. As for his Brother *Carinus*, who remained in the Weſt, neither he, nor the two preceding Emperors, *Tacitus* and *Probus*, ever gave the leaſt Diſturbance to the Chriſtians; ſo that the Church of *Rome* muſt be at the Trouble of finding out a diſtinct Place in Heaven from that of the Martyrs for *Eutychianus*, *Trophimus*, *Sabbacius*, and the illuſtrious Senator *Dorymedon*, who are ſuppoſed to have ſuffered under thoſe Princes.

Year of Chriſt 275.

Felix *not martyred.*

CARUS, CARINUS, NUMERIAN,

CAIUS,

DIOCLESIAN, MAXIMIAN.

Twenty-ſeventh BISHOP *of* Rome.

AS little is ſaid by the Antients of *Caius* as is ſaid of his Predeceſſor. A few Days after the Death of *Eutychianus*, *Caius* was choſen to ſucceed him, *Carus* and *Carinus* being Conſuls [m]. He preſided Twelve Years, Four Months, and Seven Days; that is, from the

Year of Chriſt 283.

[i] Aur. vit. p. 223. [k] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 32. Buch. p. 272. [l] Buch. ib. [m] Id. ib.

17th

Caius *not a Martyr, tho' honoured as a Martyr.*

17th of *December* 283. to the 22d of *April* 296. *Caius* too is counted by the Church of *Rome* among her Martyrs, upon the Authority of *Bede*, and of the Acts of St. *Susanna*, by which that Writer seems to have been misled. In those Acts *Caius* is said to have suffered with *Susanna* his Niece, and many others, under *Numerian:* but that Prince in his Father's Life-time had no great Power, being only *Cæsar*, and very young, and was killed on his March out of *Persia* soon after his Father's Death; so that he never reigned in the West, and but a very short time in the East. *Caius* therefore could not suffer under him at *Rome*, where his elder Brother *Carinus* governed. But the Vulgar have a particular Veneration for Martyrs, and, what turns to a very good Account, are glad to purchase their Reliques at any rate. The Church of *Rome* therefore, to provide herself with great Store of them, has multiplied beyond Belief the Number of her Martyrs; which she could not well do without multiplying at the same time the Number of the Persecutors of the Christian Religion. And hence it is that several Princes, who never molested, nay, who greatly favoured the Christians, have been by the Church of *Rome* transformed in her Martyrologies and Legends into Persecutors. As for the Acts of the supposed St. *Susanna*, they are full of Mistakes and Absurdities, and contradict the best Historians of those Times.

The Church of Rome *why so fond of Martyrs.*

Dioclesian, Maximian, **MARCELLINUS**, Constantius, Galerius.

Twenty-eighth Bishop *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 296.

MARCELLINUS succeeded *Caius* on the 30th of *June* 296. and governed Eight Years, Three Months, and Twenty-five Days, according to the most antient Records [n]: so that he must have died on the 24th of *October* 304. The Love of Truth, which an Historian ought never to swerve from, obliges me to undertake the Defence of this Pope against the Church of *Rome* herself, and most of her Divines, who, joining the *Donatists* of *Africa*, have endeavoured to blacken his Memory with Aspersions equally wicked and groundless. For the Church of *Rome* tells us, both in her Breviary and Martyrology, and her Divines must chime in with her, that *Marcellinus* being appre-

Marcellinus *unjustly aspersed by the Church of* Rome.

[n] Buch. cycl. p. 272.

hended

hended during the Perſecution of *Dioclesian*, he was perſuaded by that Prince to deliver up the Holy Scripture to be burnt by the Pagans, agreeably to a late Edict, and at the ſame time to offer Incenſe to the Gods. This they found on the Acts of the Council of *Sinueſſa*, which is ſuppoſed to have been ſummoned on that Occaſion, and before which *Marcellinus* is ſaid to have been convicted by Seventy-two Witneſſes of the above-mentioned Crimes. That ſuch a ſcandalous Story, invented by the *Donatiſts* of *Africa*, as St. *Auſtin* affirms [k], ſhould not only have been credited, but induſtriouſly propagated, by the Succeſſors of *Marcellinus*, muſt ſeem very ſtrange and ſurpriſing to thoſe, who recollect with how much Zeal they have ſtrove on other Occaſions to conceal or excuſe the leaſt Imperfections in their Predeceſſors. If therefore they not only readily own the Apoſtaſy of *Marcellinus*, but are the firſt to divulge it, and take care to make it known in the Breviary to thoſe who ſcarce know any thing elſe, we may be well aſſured there is a Snake hid in the Graſs; the more as it is certain almoſt beyond doubt, that no ſuch Council was ever held; and conſequently that the Acts upon which alone that Apoſtaſy is founded, are ſuppoſititious. To unravel the Whole, the Reader muſt know, that the Fall of *Marcellinus* made ſuch a Noiſe in the Church, as we read in thoſe Acts, that immediately a grand Council met, compoſed of no fewer than 300 Biſhops. Before this Council *Marcellinus* appeared; but, at his firſt Appearance, the Biſhops, ſtruck with Horror at the very Thought of judging the Head of the Church, the Judge of all, cried out with one Voice, *The firſt See is to be judged by no-body: accuſe yourſelf, judge yourſelf, condemn yourſelf.* To this Teſtimony, ſo favourable to the ambitious Views of the Biſhops of *Rome*, is intirely owing the Sanction which they have given to ſuch Fables, highly injurious to the Memory of one of their beſt Predeceſſors. Without this Lenitive the Acts of the pretended Council of *Sinueſſa*, ſuppoſing the Apoſtaſy of a Pope, had been condemned; the Abſurdities and Contradictions, which it is wholly made up of, had been ſet forth in a proper Light; and the Teſtimonies of *Theodoret* and St. *Auſtin* had been alleged to vindicate the Character of *Marcellinus*: for of theſe two Writers the former tells us, that he acquired great Glory by his Conduct during the Perſecution [l]; and the latter, in writing againſt *Petilian* the *Donatiſt*, has the following Words: *Why ſhould I anſwer the Calumnies with which he loads the Biſhops of* Rome? *Why*

Their View therein.

Marcellinus *commended and vindicated by the Antients.*

[k] Aug. de bapt. c. 10.

[l] Theod. l. 1. c. 2. p. 524.

ſhould I clear them from the Crimes which he lays to their Charge? Marcellinus, *and his Presbyters* Melchiades, Marcellus, *and* Sylveſter, *are accuſed by him as if they had delivered up the ſacred Books, and offered Incenſe to the Gods: Are they therefore to be thought guilty? Does he prove what he advances againſt them? He brands them with the Epithets of wicked, and ſacrilegious; but I ſay they are innocent: And why ſhould I produce Reaſons to ſupport my Defence, ſince he brings none to make good his Charge* [m]? But a ſolemn Declaration, that *the See of* Rome *is to be judged by no-body*, made in thoſe early Times, by 300 Biſhops, carries with it ſuch Marks of Truth, as quite invalidate the Teſtimonies of *Theodoret* and St. *Auſtin*, and render the Apoſtaſy of *Marcellinus*, which gave room to that Declaration, undeniable. St. *Auſtin* looks upon the Apoſtaſy of *Marcellinus*, and his Presbyters *Melchiades*, *Marcellus*, and *Sylveſter*, who were all afterwards Biſhops of *Rome*, as a mere Calumny, as an Invention of the *Donatiſts*; but their Succeſſors, trampling upon all Authority that ſtands in the Way of their Ambition, chuſe rather to have Four of their Predeceſſors thought Apoſtates and Idolaters, than part with the Decree of that pretended Council, exalting them ſo high above all other Biſhops.

The Acts of the Council of Sinueſſa *fabulous.*

If *Marcellinus* acquired great Glory during the Perſecution, as *Theodoret* aſſures us; if his Apoſtaſy was a mere Calumny, broached by the *Donatiſts*, as we read in St. *Auſtin*; the pretended Council of *Sinueſſa* muſt be given up, ſince it is ſuppoſed to have been aſſembled on occaſion of *Marcellinus*'s Fall: but, abſtracting from the Fall of *Marcellinus*, the Circumſtances attending that Council are in themſelves ſo abſurd and incredible, that there needs no other Argument to convince a Man, who has any Underſtanding, and dares to uſe it, that no ſuch Council ever was, or could be held. For who can conceive it poſſible, that, during the moſt cruel Perſecution the Church ever ſuffered, 300 Biſhops ſhould aſſemble, not in *Rome*, where they might more eaſily have met unobſerved, but in a ſmall Country Town, where a much leſs numerous Aſſembly muſt immediately have been obſerved and ſuſpected? But, after the Death of *Fabianus*, ſays *Baronius* [n], the Clergy of *Rome*, and the Biſhops, met to chuſe him a Succeſſor, notwithſtanding the Perſecution that raged then. He ought to have ſaid *ſome Biſhops*, as St. *Cyprian* does [o], whom he

No ſuch Council ever held.

[m] Aug. in Pet. c. 16. t. 7. p. 87. [n] Bar. ad ann. 303. n. 102, 105. [o] Cyp. ep. 31.

quotes;

quotes; but I ſhall ſay ſo for him, that his Argument may appear in its full Strength, and ſave me the Trouble of anſwering it; for it will then run thus: Some Biſhops, perhaps 15 or 20, met unobſerved in the great and populous City of *Rome: Ergo*, 300 might meet unobſerved in a ſmall Country Town; for ſuch was *Sinueſſa*.

This Council is ſuppoſed to have been held in a Grotto, or Cave, where there was no room but for 50 at a time; and yet they are all ſaid to have been preſent when *Marcellinus* owned his Crime, and diveſted himſelf of his Dignity. And what a deſpicable Figure does he make on that Occaſion! At firſt he denies the Charge; but, being convicted by 72 Eye-witneſſes, he owns it at laſt, but in Terms more becoming a School-boy, trembling at the Sight of a Rod, than a penitent Biſhop, before ſo grave an Aſſembly. But the moſt remarkable Paſſage in that Piece is the Diſpute between *Urbanus* High Pontiff of *Jupiter*, and *Marcellinus* High Pontiff of the Chriſtians. *Urbanus*, to convince his Fellow-Pontiff that he ought not to ſcruple offering Incenſe to *Jupiter*, alleges the Example of the Mages offering Incenſe to *Chriſt*. *Marcellinus* anſwers, That the offering of Incenſe on that Occaſion was myſterious; and unravels the Myſtery. Hereupon *Urbanus*, unacquainted with Myſteries, appeals to the Judgment of the Emperors *Diocleſian* and *Maximian*; to this Appeal *Marcellinus* agrees; and the Controverſy is referred by both *Pontiffs* to be decided by the Two Emperors. They, no doubt, gave Sentence in favour of *Jupiter* and *Urbanus*; and then *Diocleſian*, taking *Marcellinus* with him into the Temple of *Veſta*, perſuaded him there to offer Incenſe to *Jupiter*, *Hercules*, and *Saturn*. How theſe Three Deities came to have a Place in the Temple of *Veſta*, the Compiler of theſe Acts alone knows. Such are the Abſurdities and Contradictions, of which that Piece is wholly made up. But it flatters the Ambition of the Succeſſors of *Marcellinus*; on occaſion of his Fall it exalts the See of *Rome* above all other Sees: its Authority therefore muſt not be called in queſtion: all the Abſurdities and Contradictions it contains, muſt be blindly believed; the Memory of *Marcellinus* moſt unjuſtly ſlandered; the Teſtimonies of *Theodoret*, and St. *Auſtin*, clearing him from all Guilt, diſregarded and rejected. And may not this be interpreted as a tacit Declaration, that they had rather he had been guilty than innocent, provided his Guilt could any-ways contribute to the Aggrandizing of their See? What can we think their Ambition will ſpare, ſince they have thus ſacrificed to it

The many Abſurdities contained in the Acts of that Council.

the Character of one of their Predeceſſors, whoſe Memory is revered by all Antiquity? The Church of *Rome* honours *Marcellinus* as a Saint; and, notwithſtanding his pretended Apoſtaſy, allows him a Place amongſt her Martyrs; probably by way of Reparation for the Iujuſtice done him. But his Martyrdom may be juſtly queſtioned; at leaſt it ſeems to have been utterly unknown to St. *Auſtin*, who flouriſhed not long after his Time, ſince he never mentions it, tho' it would have afforded him the ſtrongeſt Argument he could poſſibly uſe to ſilence the *Donatiſts*. His Martyrdom, 'tis true, is vouched by *Bede*, who tells us, that he was beheaded at *Rome*, by *Dioclesian*'s Order; but that Hiſtorian is often led into groſs Miſtakes by a Pontifical, ſuppoſed to have been written in the Sixth Century, which he frequently copies, with all its Anachroniſms, and other Faults.

Marcellinus *falſly ſuppoſed to have died a Martyr.*

That, upon the Death of *Marcellinus*, there happened a Vacancy of ſome Years, ſeems undeniable, ſince it is marked in the Pontificals, even in that of *Bucherius* [p], and mentioned by all thoſe who, till *Baronius*'s Time, have wrote the Hiſtory of the Popes: but what at this time ſhould occaſion a Vacancy at leaſt of Three Years, is what I will not take upon me to account for: the Perſecution laſted but Two Years in *Italy*, according to *Euſebius* [q], which expired ſoon after the Death of *Marcellinus*: ſome pretend that it raged there ſo long as *Galerius* was Maſter of that Country. Be that as it will, it is certain, that *Maxentius* uſurped the Empire in 306. and that he not only favoured the Chriſtians, but pretended to be of the ſame Religion himſelf; and yet the See remained vacant, according to the Pontifical of *Bucherius* [r], till the Tenth Conſulate of *Maximian Hercules*, and the Seventh of *Maximian Galerius*, that is, till the Year 308. *Baronius* indeed admits of no Vacancy; but, in Oppoſition to all thoſe who have wrote before him, places the Election of *Marcellus* immediately after the Deceaſe of his Predeceſſor *Marcellinus* [s]. This I ſhould readily agree to, but for the Authority of the abovementioned Pontifical, which had not yet appeared in *Baronius*'s Time, and is thought to have been written about the Year 354. As for the Chronicle of *Euſebius*, it can be here of no Weight on the one Side or the other, ſince *Marcellus* is there quite left out; and his Succeſſor *Melchiades* is ſaid to have died before *Conſtantine* made

Vacancy of Three Years.

[p] Buch. p. 272. [q] Euſeb l. 8. c. 14. [r] Buch. ib. [s] Bar. ad ann. 304. n. 26, 27.

himſelf Maſter of *Rome*; whereas it is certain, that, under *Melchiades*, a Council was held at *Rome*, by that Prince's Order, as we ſhall ſee hereafter.

MAXIMIAN, CONSTANTIUS, **MARCELLUS,** GALERIUS, CONSTANTINE.

Twenty-ninth BISHOP *of* Rome.

UPON the Death of *Marcellinus*, the See remained vacant ſomewhat above Three Years and an Half; that is, from the 24th of *October* 304. to the 19th of *May* 308. when *Marcellus* was choſen in his room, Thus ſays the Pontifical of *Bucherius*, where, inſtead of Seven Years, which is a Miſtake of the Tranſcribers, as is manifeſt from the Conſulſhips mark'd there, we muſt read Three [t]. The Similitude of the Two Names has miſled ſome Writers to confound *Marcellinus* with *Marcellus*; for *Euſebius*, as well as St. *Jerom* only mention the former; and *Theodoret*, omitting both *Marcellus* and *Euſebius*, who ſucceeded him, names *Melchiades* as the immediate Succeſſor of *Marcellinus* [u]; which has made Dr. *Pearſon* doubt, whether *Marcellus* was ever Biſhop of *Rome* [w]. But *Marcellinus* and *Marcellus* are evidently diſtinguiſhed in the Pontifical of *Bucherius*, by the different Times, in which they governed, and the different Conſuls, under whom their Government began and ended [x]. They are, beſides, diſtinguiſhed both by *Optatus Milevitanus* [y], and St. *Auſtin* [z], who ſpeaks of *Marcellus*, not only as a Presbyter of the Church of *Rome*, but as Biſhop of that See. To theſe Teſtimonies I may add the Epitaph of *Marcellus* by Pope *Damaſus*, ſuppoſing him to have been Biſhop of *Rome* [a]. *Damaſus* flouriſhed about the Year 366. Many things are ſaid of *Marcellus*; but they are all founded either on his Acts, or the modern Pontificals, and conſequently have no Foundation at all. Pope *Damaſus*, in his Epitaph, tells us, that his Steadineſs in keeping up the Diſcipline of the Church, and obliging ſuch as had fallen, during the Perſecution, to give due Satisfaction, ſtirred up againſt him a general Hatred, which, not confined to private Diſputes and Invectives, ended in Tumults, Blood-

Year of Chriſt 308.

Marcellinus *and* Marcellus *confounded by ſome Writers*;

but diſtinguiſhed by others.

[t] Buch. p. 272. [u] Theod. l. 1. c. 2. [w] Pearſ. poſt. 109. [x] Buch. p. 272. [y] Opt. l. 2. p. 48. [z] Aug. ep. 165. & in Petil. c. 16. p. 87. [a] Vide Bolland. 16. Jan. p. 5.

ſhed,

ſhed, and Murders [b]. *Damaſus* adds, that *the Crime of one, who had renounced the Faith, while the Church enjoyed a profound Peace, induced the Tyrant* Maxentius *to ſend* Marcellus *into Baniſhment*. But of theſe Tranſactions the Antients either have not thought fit to give us a more particular Account, or, if they did, their Writings have not reached our Times. *Marcellus* died on the 16th of *January* 310. having held the Pontificate One Year, Seven Months, and Twenty Days [c]; but whether he died in Baniſhment, or was recalled to *Rome*, is uncertain. The Church of *Rome*, upon the Authority of his fabulous Acts, has added him, with many others, to the Number of her Martyrs: but *Maxentius*, who reigned at *Rome*, during his Pontificate, and under whom he is ſaid to have ſuffered, had no ſooner made himſelf Maſter of that City, than he put an End to the Perſecution, as we are told, in expreſs Terms, by *Euſebius* [d]. He is ſaid to have been buried in the Cœmetery of *Priſcilla*, on the *Salarian* Way [e]; but his Body, like the Bodies of moſt other Saints, is now worſhiped in ſeveral Places; *viz.* in a Church, bearing his Name, at *Rome*; in the Abbey of *Omont* in *Hainaut*, not far from *Maubeuge*; at *Cluni*, in a Pariſh-Church of the Dioceſe of *Elne* in *Rouſſillon* [f], &c.

Marcellus *is baniſhed.*

His Acts are fabulous.

His Reliques.

CONSTANTINE, **EUSEBIUS,** LICINIUS.

Thirtieth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 310.

MARCELLUS was ſucceeded by *Euſebius*, who governed Seven Months, according to *Euſebius* [g], but only Four Months and Sixteen Days, according to the Pontifical of *Bucherius* [h]. From an antient Epitaph on this Pope, we learn, that he oppoſed, with great Vigour and Zeal, one *Heraclius*, pretending that thoſe who had fallen during the Perſecution, ought to be readmitted to the Communion of the Church, without giving ſuch Satisfaction as was then required; and that hereupon great Diviſions happening among the People, *Maxentius*, to put an End to thoſe Diſturbances, baniſhed *Euſebius* into *Sicily* [i]. Many other things are ſaid of him by *Anaſta-*

Stands up in Defence of the Diſcipline of the Church, and is baniſhed.

[b] Bar. ad ann. 309. [c] Buch. p. 272. [d] Euſeb. l. 8. c. 14. [e] Boll. Jan. 16. p. 5. [f] Idem, & Flor. in Martyr. Hier. p. 256, 257. [g] Euſeb. chron. [h] Buch. p. 272. [i] Bar. ad ann. 311.

ſius,

ſius, Platina, Ciacconius, and ſuch-like Writers; but what we read in them has no better Foundation than what is advanced by *Baronius*; *viz.* that he inſtructed *Euſebius* the celebrated Biſhop of *Vercelli*, and gave him his own Name [k]; which is founded on the Acts of that Biſhop, now univerſally rejected as ſuppoſititious.

CONSTANTINE, **MELCHIADES,** LICINIUS.

Thirty-firſt BISHOP *of* Rome.

MELCHIADES, or *Miltiades*, as he is called in the antient Manuſcripts, was choſen to ſucceed *Euſebius*, on the 2d of *July* 311. after a Vacancy of Nine Months, and upwards [l]; which Hiſtorians do not account for. In his Time happened the ever memorable Converſion of *Conſtantine* to the Chriſtian Religion. That Prince, having overcome and utterly defeated the Uſurper *Maxentius*, on the 28th of *October* 312. ſoon after iſſued an Edict, jointly with *Licinius*, who was upon the point of marrying his Siſter, allowing the Chriſtians the free Exerciſe of their Religion, and likewiſe the Liberty of building Churches [m]. By the ſame Edict he ordered the Places, where they had held their Aſſemblies before the Perſecution, and which had been taken from them, to be reſtored [n]. He left *Rome* in the Beginning of the Year 313. and, arriving at *Milan*, he there iſſued a Second Edict, to correct ſome Miſtakes that had given Offence in the former [o]. What theſe Miſtakes were, we know not; for the Decree itſelf has not reached our Times; but *Valeſius* conjectures, that the high Commendations beſtowed on the Chriſtian Religion alarmed the Pagans, imagining, that the Intention of the Two Princes was to ſuppreſs theirs; and likewiſe, that ſome Chriſtians had taken Offence at the odious Name of Heretics, given, in that Decree, to the various Sects ſprung from them [p]. Be that as it will, it is certain, that, by the Second Decree, an intire Liberty of Conſcience was granted to all ſorts of Perſons, every one being allowed to honour and worſhip what Deity he pleaſed, and in what manner ſoever he thought beſt. The Second Edict ſtrictly injoins all thoſe, who had purchaſed of the Exchequer, or held by Grant, any Place formerly

Year of Chriſt 311.

Conſtantine *converted to the Chriſtian Religion.*

His Edicts in favour of the Chriſtians.

[k] Idem ib. n. 42 [l] Buch. p. 272. [m] Euſeb. l. 9. c. 9. [n] Idem, l. 10. c. 5.
[o] Idem ib. [p] Val. in not. ad Euſeb. hiſt. p. 195.

deſtined

destined for the Assemblies of the Christians, to restore them forthwith, and apply to the Exchequer; where they should be indemnified [q]. The same Year 313. *Licinius*, having gained a complete Victory over *Maximinus*, a sworn Enemy to the Christians, made himself Master of *Nicomedia*, and there caused the Edict of *Milan* to be proclaimed, and set up in the Market-place, on the 13th of *June* [r]. Thus Peace was restored to the Church, in the East as well as in the West, after a most cruel and bloody Persecution of Ten Years, and almost Four Months; for the First Edict against the Christians had been published in that very City on the 24th of *February* 303 [s].

The Schism of the Donatists *in* Africa.

Another remarkable Incident of this Pontificate was, the famous Schism, formed in *Africa* against *Cæcilianus*, the Catholic Bishop of *Carthage*; whereof a succinct Account will not be foreign to my Subject, as *Melchiades* was chiefly concerned in most of the Transactions relating to it. The First Decree against the Christians, published by *Diocletian*, which I have just now mentioned, ordered the Churches to be every-where laid level with the Ground, the Books of the Scripture to be carefully sought for, and publicly burnt; and that such Persons of Quality as should persist in the Profession of the Christian Faith, should be deemed infamous, and excluded from all Honours and Employments. This Edict was executed with such Rigour in *Africa*, that it was a capital Crime in the Magistrates of the Cities, and punishable with Death, to shew any Mercy or Compassion to a Christian, who, owning he had the sacred Books, should refuse to deliver them into the Hands of the proper Officers. Those who, in Compliance with this Edict, delivered them up, which great Numbers did, were styled *Traditores*, a Name, which afterwards became famous in the History of the Church, by affording the *Donatists* a plausible Pretence to separate themselves from the Communion of the Catholic Bishops [t]. Of this Crime *Mensurius*, Bishop of *Carthage*, was falsly accused; but, though the Charge could not be proved against him, yet some of his Flock, encouraged by *Donatus*, Bishop of *Casænigræ* in *Numidia*, separated from his Communion [u]. *Mensurius* dying some Years after, *Cæcilianus*, Deacon of the Church of *Carthage*, was chosen in his room, in Spite of the Cabals and Intrigues of *Botrus* and *Cælesius*, Two chief Presbyters, who aspired to

Traditores *who.*

[q] Euseb. ib. [r] Lact. pers. c. 47, 48. [s] Idem ib. [t] Aug. l. 7. c. 2. Opt. l. 1. p. 39. [u] Aug. collat. Carth. die 3. c. 12. Vales. in not. ad Euseb. hist. p. 191.

that

that Dignity. *Cæcilianus*, ſoon after his Election, ſummoned ſome Perſons, in whoſe Cuſtody his Predeceſſor had left the Money of the Church, to deliver it up to him: but they not only refuſed to comply with his Demand, but began to ſtir up the People, and form a Party againſt him. *Botrus* and *Cæleſius* were not idle on this Occaſion, but, animated with Jealouſy and Envy, left no Art unpractiſed to blacken his Character, and diſcredit him with thoſe who had preferred him to them. But the chief Support of this Faction was *Lucilla*, a Woman of great Quality, Wealth, and Intereſt, and an avowed Enemy to *Cæcilianus*, who, while he was yet Deacon, had publicly reprimanded her for kiſſing the Relique of a Martyr, as ſhe was upon the Point of receiving the Euchariſt. An undeniable Proof, that the Worſhip of Reliques was at this time diſapproved by the Church. Such Liberty taken with a Perſon of her Rank, was what ſhe could not brook; and therefore ſhe laid hold of the firſt Opportunity that offered, and no better could offer, to revenge the Affront [w]. It is not to be doubted but thoſe, who had ſeparated from *Menſurius*, joined this Faction, ſince the Second Schiſm owed its Origin to the Firſt, as St. *Auſtin* ſays, ſpeaking of the Two Schiſms under *Menſurius* and *Cæcilianus* [x].

The chief Authors of the Schiſm againſt Cæcilianus.

The Schiſmatics, to give an Appearance of Juſtice and Authority to their Proceedings, ſummoned *Secundus* Biſhop of *Tigiſis*, and the other Biſhops of *Numidia*, to depoſe *Cæcilianus*, and chuſe another in his room; for the Biſhops of *Numidia* claimed the Privilege of aſſiſting at the Election of the Biſhop of *Carthage*, and ordaining him after he was elected [y]. They readily complied with the Summons; but, upon their Arrival, they found, to their great Surprize, that the whole City, except a ſmall Number of Schiſmatics, the avowed Enemies of *Cæcilianus*, communicated with him as their lawful Biſhop [z]. They were 70 in Number; but as many of them were *Traditors*, and ſome guilty of other enormous Crimes, as appears from the Acts of the Council of *Cirtha* [a], they were eaſily prevailed upon by *Lucilla*, who is ſaid to have ſpent an immenſe Sum on this Occaſion [b], to declare the Election of *Cæcilianus* void, and the See of *Carthage* vacant. The only thing they could lay to his Charge

The Biſhops of Numidia *ſummoned to depoſe him.*

They declare his Election null.

[w] Opt. l. 1. p. 41. Aug. Pſal. Abced. p. 3. in Petil. c. 18. & contr. epiſt. Parmen. p. 7. [x] Aug. coll. Carth. die 3. c. 12. [y] Aug. in Par. l. 1. c. 3. & Pſal. Abced. p. 3. Opt. p. 41. [z] Opt. ib. [a] Aug. in Creſc. l. 3. c. 26, 27, 29. & coll. die 3. c. 17. die 2. c. 14, &c. [b] Aug. in Gaud. l. 1. c. 37. ep. 162. & in Pſal. 36. p. 119.

was, that he had been ordained by *Felix* Biſhop of *Aptungus*, whom they falſly accuſed as a *Traditor*. *Cæcilianus* refuſed to appear before them; and truly, to truſt himſelf to ſuch an Aſſembly, had been acting a very imprudent Part; for *Purpurius*, Biſhop of *Limata*, had ſaid, *If he comes among us, inſtead of laying our Hands upon him, by way of Ordination, we ought to knock out his Brains, by way of Penance* [a].

The Schiſmatics ſeparate themſelves from the Communion of the Church.

The Party having thus declared *Cæcilianus* illegally elected and ordained, they ſeparated themſelves from his Communion, and from the Communion of all who communicated with him [b]; that is, from the Communion of the Catholic Church; for *Cæcilianus* was acknowleged by the other Biſhops of *Africa*, by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and by all the Biſhops of the World, ſays St. *Auſtin* [c]. Such was the Riſe of the famous Schiſm, which, for the Space of 300 Years, and upwards, occaſioned great Diſturbances in the Churches of *Africa*. *Donatus*, Biſhop of *Caſænigræ* in *Numidia*, was the firſt Author of it, according to St. *Auſtin* [d]; but it was not from him, but from *Donatus*, the Schiſmatic Biſhop of *Carthage*, that they took the Name of *Donatiſts*; for, till his Time, they ſtyled themſelves the Party of *Majorinus* [e], whom they choſe and ordained Biſhop of *Carthage*, in the room of *Cæcilianus*; though he was then only Lector of that Church, and had been formerly one of *Lucilla*'s menial Servants [f]. To juſtify their Conduct, and their electing a new Biſhop, they wrote Letters to all the Churches of *Africa*, filled with Calumnies againſt *Cæcilianus*, and thoſe who had ordained him. By theſe Letters great Numbers were impoſed upon, and miſled; inſomuch that, the People being every-where divided, moſt Churches had Two Biſhops, the one ordained by *Majorinus*, and the other by *Cæcilianus* [g].

Called Donatiſts, *and from whom.*

Edicts enacted by Conſtantine, *in favour of the Chriſtian Religion.*

About this time, that is, about the Year 313. *Conſtantine*, out of his Zeal for the Chriſtian Religion, iſſued Two Decrees, addreſſed to *Anulinus*, Proconſul of *Africa*, the one commanding all the Places in that Province to be reſtored, which had once belonged to the Catholic Church, and might have been uſurped during the Perſecution [h]; and the other, exempting the Eccleſiaſtics from all civil Functions [i]. This Privilege was granted only to the Eccleſiaſtics of the Catholic Church, whereof *Cæcilianus* was the Head, as was ex-

[a] Opt. p. 41. [b] Aug. coll. die 3. c. 14. [c] Idem ep. 162. [d] In Joann. evang. tract. 69. p. 12. [e] Hier. vir. ill. c. 93. [f] Opt. l. 1. p. 42. [g] Aug. ep. 162. [h] Euſeb. l. 10. c. 5. [i] Idem ib. c. 7. & Cod. Theod. 16. t. 2. l. 1. p. 20.

preſly

preſly declared in the Edict, and therefore to him alone the Proconſul imparted it. It was a great Mortification to the *Donatiſts* to ſee themſelves thus diſregarded by the Emperor: they therefore aſſembled a few Days after, and, drawing up a Petition to *Conſtantine*, they delivered it, unſealed, to *Anulinus*, together with a Bundle of Papers, ſealed up in a Leather Bag, with this Title: *The Petition of the Catholic Church, containing the Crimes of* Cæcilianus; *by the Party of* Majorinus. The Subſtance of the Petition was, that the Controverſy between them and the other Biſhops of *Africa* might be referred to the Biſhops of *Gaul*, who were free from the Imputation of having delivered up the ſacred Books to the Pagans [k]. *Anulinus* immediately diſpatched a Meſſenger to the Emperor, both with the Requeſt, and the Papers, giving him, at the ſame time, by a Letter ſtill extant [l], an Inſight into the Diſpute, that made ſo great a Noiſe in *Africa*. *Conſtantine*, who was then in *Gaul*, having received and read all thoſe Pieces, expreſſed great Concern to find the Chriſtians thus divided among themſelves, and the Biſhops at Variance with one another [m]. However, he readily granted to the *Donatiſts* the Judges they demanded, naming, for that Purpoſe, *Maternus* Biſhop of *Cologne*, *Rheticius* Biſhop of *Autun*, and *Marinus* Biſhop of *Arles* [n]; all Men of known Integrity, great Learning, and unblemiſhed Characters. To theſe, by a Letter under his own Hand, he gave Notice of their new Commiſſion; and, at the ſame time, for their better Information, he cauſed Copies to be tranſmitted to them, of all the Papers he had received from *Anulinus* [o]. The Three Biſhops were ordered to repair, with all Speed, to *Rome*, and there, jointly with *Melchiades*, Biſhop of that City, to ſit as Judges of the Controverſy. *Cæcilianus* likewiſe was ordered to *Rome*, and allowed to take with him Ten Biſhops of his Party, ſuch as he ſhould judge the moſt capable of defending his Cauſe; and the ſame Liberty was granted to the adverſe Party [p]. *Conſtantine*, in the Letter he wrote on this Occaſion to *Melchiades*, after appealing to him as a Witneſs of the Reſpect and Veneration he had for the Catholic Church, declares, he had nothing ſo much at Heart as to ſee her Members happily united: he therefore earneſtly intreats him to examine the Affair with the utmoſt Attention, and, jointly with the

The Donatiſts *petition* Conſtantine, *that the Diſpute may be referred to the Biſhops of* Gaul.

The Biſhops named by Conſtantine.

His Letter to Melchiades.

[k] Aug. ep. 68. Valeſ. in not. ad hiſt. Euſeb. p. 197. [l] Coll. Carth. in concil. per Steph. Baluz. c. 3. n. 216, 220. p. 578. [m] Opt. l. 1. p. 44. [n] Opt. ib. Aug. ep. 166. [o] Euſeb. l. 10. c. 5. [p] Coll. Carth. p. 149.

Biſhops of *Gaul*, to judge it according to the ſtricteſt Laws of Juſtice and Equity [q]. In this Letter *Conſtantine* names no other Judges but the Three Biſhops of *Gaul*, *Melchiades*, and one *Mark*, ſuppoſed to have been Biſhop of *Milan*, whom he joins with *Melchiades*; but afterwards he ordered Seven more to be added to the Number, and as many as could ſoon and conveniently aſſemble; ſo that they were at laſt 19 in all [r]. They met, for the firſt time, on *Friday* the Second of *October* 313. *Conſtantine* and *Licinius* being the third time Conſuls [s]. The Place they met in was the Apartment of *Fauſta*, in the *Lateran* Palace [t], ſhe being then, in all Likelihood, abſent in *Gaul*, with the Emperor her Husband. Before this Aſſembly *Cæcilianus* appeared as the Perſon accuſed, and *Donatus* of *Caſænigræ* as the Accuſer. They had but Three Meetings: in the Firſt the Characters of the Accuſers and Witneſſes were ſtrictly inquired into, and their Depoſitions heard; in the Second the Acts of the Council of *Carthage*, which had condemned *Cæcilianus*, as I have related above, were examined; and in the laſt *Cæcilianus*, againſt whom nothing had been proved, was abſolved, and *Donatus* condemned as a Slanderer, and the chief Author of the Schiſm [u]. An Account of the Whole, together with the Acts of the Council, was immediately tranſmitted to *Conſtantine*, who began to flatter himſelf, that he had put an End to the Diſpute; for he could not imagine, that the *Donatiſts* would appeal from the Judgment of ſuch unexceptionable Judges, of Judges whom they themſelves had demanded. But the good Prince was yet a Stranger to the Nature of religious Diſputes, to the Heat, Animoſity, and enthuſiaſtic Rancour, with which they are commonly carried on. Notwithſtanding the Pains he took, and his Succeſſors after him, and no Pains they ſpared to heal theſe unhappy Diviſions, they continued, to the great Scandal of the Pagans, rending the Church into moſt furious Parties and Factions, for the Space of near 300 Years. The Council of *Rome* was held in the Month of *October* 313. and *Melchiades* died on the Tenth of *January* enſuing, *Voluſianus* and *Anienus* being Conſuls, having preſided for the Space of Two Years, Six Months, and Eight Days [w]. About an hundred Years after, the *Donatiſts* charged him with having delivered up the ſacred Books, and offered Incenſe to the Pagan Gods; but this St. *Auſtin* calls a groundleſs Charge, a mere Calumny, a

The Council of Rome.

Cæcilianus *abſolved, and* Donatus *condemned.*

Melchiades *dies.*

[q] Euſeb. ib. [r] Opt. l. 1. p. 44. [s] Aug. coll. Carth. die 3. c. 17. Opt. ib.
[t] Opt. ib. [u] Coll. Carth. p. 149. & ep. 162. Opt. ib. [w] Buch. p. 272.

malicious

malicious Invention of the *Donatiſts* of his Time to juſtify the Conduct of their Predeceſſors, in appealing, as they did, from the Council of *Rome*, at which *Melchiades* aſſiſted, and probably preſided, as Biſhop of the Imperial City [x].

Baronius, impatient to ſee the Pope raiſed to the Rank of a Prince, endeavours to prove, that *Melchiades* was placed in that Station by *Conſtantine*, and argues thus: The Council of *Rome* was held in the *Lateran* Palace; therefore that Palace had been given by *Conſtantine* to *Melchiades*, and belonged to him; for that an Aſſembly of Nineteen Biſhops only ſhould meet in ſo ſpacious a Place, can no otherwiſe be accounted for, but by ſuppoſing the Pope to have reſided there. This he calls a Demonſtration [y]. Having thus got him a Palace, and, no doubt, magnificently furniſhed, he finds no Difficulty in equipping him in every other reſpect as a Prince: For who can imagine, ſays he, that *Conſtantine*, ſo pious, ſo generous a Prince, would have given to the Head of the Church a Royal Palace to live in, and not allow him at the ſame time a ſuitable Retinue, with ſuitable Appointments? To act otherwiſe, had not been honouring, but diſgracing the Chriſtian Religion, ſince its High Pontiff, ſtalking about all alone in a huge Palace, could be but an Object of Ridicule to the Pontiffs of the Pagan Superſtition, who lived in magnificent Houſes, with anſwerable Grandeur [z]. Thus is the Biſhop ~~m~~etamorphoſed at once into a Sovereign. But the Metamorphoſis is ſomewhat premature. If *Conſtantine*, yet a *Neophyte*, was not well acquainted with the true Spirit of the Chriſtian Religion, *Melchiades* was; and therefore, had that Prince offered to diſtinguiſh him by any ſuch Marks of worldly Grandeur, I do not queſtion but, as he was a very good Man, he would have taken from thence an Opportunity of inſtructing him better in the Principles of his new Profeſſion, and ſhewing him in what Contempt the Chriſtian Prelates had, and he himſelf ought to have, all worldly Grandeur. But no ſuch Offer was ever made or dreamt of: For what at length is all this founded on? On the Meeting of the Council in the *Lateran* Palace. The *French* Academy meet in the *Louvre*: Are they therefore Princes? And does not *Optatus*, of whom we have the whole Account, call it in expreſs Terms the Houſe of *Fauſta* [a]? *Fauſta* perhaps lived there, ſays *Baronius*, during the long and flouriſhing

Whether the Lateran *Palace was given by* Conſtantine *to* Melchiades.

[x] Aug. in Pet. p. 87. & in Par. c. 5. p. 8. [y] Bar. ad ann. 312. n. 82. [z] Id. ib. n. 85. [a] Opt. l. 1. p. 44.

Reign of her Father *Maximian*, and thence it might be called the House of *Fausta*. Thus in the End is his Demonstration dwindled away to a mere Conjecture, and a very groundless one too: But, waving that, why might not *Fausta* continue in the same Palace after her Father's Death, with her Husband *Constantine*, when he was at *Rome*, or alone, when she did not attend him in the Wars? The Annalist seems to have forgot that *Fausta* was *Constantine*'s Wife. But, after all, the Empress, as it appears to me, had only an Apartment in the *Lateran*; for in this Sense I understand *Optatus* saying, *The Council was held in the House*, or *Habitation, of* Fausta *in the* Lateran: But her being any ways there excludes *Melchiades*. Their sitting in the Imperial Palace gave a kind of Authority and Sanction to their Decisions; and besides, there might not be room in the House of *Melchiades*, if he had a House, for the Council, and those who were to attend it, they being in all Forty Bishops; so that we need not put *Melchiades* in Possession of that Palace to account for the Council's meeting in it, as *Baronius* has done.

CONSTANTINE.

SYLVESTER,

Thirty-second BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 314.

SYLVESTER was chosen in the room of *Melchiades* on the last of *January* 314 [b]. In his time were held the two great Councils of *Arles* and *Nice*. The former was convened by *Constantine*'s Order at the Request of the *Donatists*, who, instead of acquiescing to the Judgment of the Council of *Rome*, loudly complained to the Emperor of the Bishops, who composed it, as partial, prejudiced, and over-hasty in deciding a Controversy of the greatest Importance [c]. *Constantine* heard them with great Patience; and that he might leave them no Colour or Pretence whatsoever to continue in their Schism, he summoned a second Council to meet at *Arles*, inviting several Bishops to it with most pathetic Letters under his own Hand, and ordering the Proconsuls and Governors of Provinces to acquaint the rest with his Desire and Intention. *Chrestus*, or *Crescentius*, Bishop of *Syracuse*, was allowed, and so, without all doubt, were the rest,

The Donatists *complain of the Council of* Rome.

The Council of Arles.

[b] Buch. p. 272. [c] Euseb. l. 10. c. 5.

to

to bring two Presbyters with him, and three Attendants, as we learn from the Emperor's Letter to him, which is ſtill extant [d]. They were all to be ſupplied with Conveniences for traveling, and every thing elſe, at the public Expence. The Time appointed for their Meeting was the firſt of *Auguſt* 314. and on that Day they met accordingly [e], not from all Parts of the World, as we read in the Acts of the ſecond Council of *Arles* [f], but from *Africa*, and moſt other Provinces of the Weſt. *Sylveſter* Biſhop of *Rome* was invited to it, but he excuſed himſelf on account of his Age, and ſent in his room the two Presbyters, *Claudianus* and *Vitus*, with *Eugenius* and *Cyriacus*, Deacons: The Biſhop of *Oſtia* ſent likewiſe two Presbyters in his room [g]. By this Aſſembly, *Cæcilianus* was again declared innocent, and thoſe who ſhould falſly accuſe their Brethren cut off from the Communion of the Church, without Hopes of being ever re-admitted, except at the Point of Death [h]. As to the ſchiſmatic Biſhops, it was agreed, that ſuch of them as abandoned the Schiſm ſhould not forfeit their Dignity, but ſit alternatively with the Catholic Biſhop till one of them died [i]. The Council, before they broke up, acquainted the Biſhop of *Rome* with their Proceedings, and at the ſame time ſent him the Decrees they had made concerning the Diſcipline of the Church, not to be confirmed by him, as *Baronius* would make us believe [k], but that *by his means, as he held larger Dioceſes, they might be the ſooner known.* Theſe are the very Words of the Council [l] (A).

Cæcilianus *declared innocent.*

The

[d] Euſeb. ib. & concil. t. 1. p. 157. [e] Euſeb. & concil. ib. [f] Conc. Gen. t. 1. p. 106. [g] Concil. p. 1425. [h] Concil. ib. [i] Concil. ib. [k] Bar. ad ann. 314. n. 68. [l] Concil. p. 1425.

(A) Several Canons were made by this Council relating to the Diſcipline of the Church. 1. It was ordained that *Eaſter* ſhould be kept on the ſame Day, and on a *Sunday*, by all the Churches in the World; and that the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhould acquaint the other Churches with the Day. But it was afterwards ordained, that the Biſhop of *Alexandria* ſhould fix the Day, and give timely notice of it to the Biſhop of *Rome*, that by his means it might be notified to the whole Church. This Ordinance St. *Cyril* ſeems to aſcribe to the Council of *Nice*; for he ſays that it was *ſo enacted by a Synod compoſed of all the Saints of the Earth*; which, at the Time he wrote, that is about the Year 360. could be ſaid of no other Synod but that of *Nice*. Pope *Leo the Great*, ſpeaking of this Cuſtom in a Letter to the Emperor *Marcian*, only ſays, that it was *eſtabliſhed by the holy Fathers* (1). He meant, perhaps, the Fathers of *Nice*. But as they took no notice of ſuch a Cuſtom in their Letter to the Church of *Egypt*, I cannot ſuppoſe it to have been introduced by them. The Care of fixing the Day, and acquainting the Biſhop of *Rome* with it, was probably committed to the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, becauſe the *Egyptians* were thought to be better acquaint-

(1) Leo, ep. 94. c. 1.

ed

The other grand Council that was held during the Pontificate of *Sylveſter* was that of *Nice*, ſo famous in the Hiſtory of the Church:

ed with the Motions of the heavenly Bodies than any other Nation. In other Provinces the Biſhops ſeem to have been utter Strangers to Aſtronomy, and to that Ignorance was chiefly owing their Diſagreement with reſpect to the Celebration of *Eaſter*. This Cuſtom ſtill obtained in the Fifth Century, as appears from a Letter of *Leo the Great*, dated the 28th of *July* 454. For by that Letter he acquaints the Biſhops of *Gaul* and *Spain*, that the following Year 455. *Eaſter* would fall on the 24th of *April*, *as it had been ſettled in the Eaſt* (2). Before his Time *Innocent* I. being at a Loſs to know on what Day *Eaſter* ſhould be kept in 414. had Recourſe to *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, intreating him to examine that Point in a Council, and let him know what they determined, that he might notify it, as was cuſtomary, to other Churches. *Innocent* had quarreled, on *Chryſoſtom*'s Account, with the Eaſtern Biſhops; and therefore choſe rather to be informed and directed by the *African* Biſhops than by them. 2. It was decreed, that ſuch as had been baptized by Heretics in the Name of the Trinity, ſhould not be rebaptized, but admitted into the Church only by the Impoſition of Hands. But to this Decree of the Council no greater Regard was paid than had been paid in St. *Cyprian*'s Time to the Deciſions of Pope *Stephen*. For in the Year 370. the ſame Practice of rebaptizing Heretics ſtill obtained in ſeveral Churches of *Africa*, as appears from *Optatus*, who wrote about that time. In the Eaſt ſome held, and ſome denied, the Validity of Baptiſm adminiſtered by an Heretic. Of the latter Opinion was the Great *Athanaſius*, who flouriſhed from the Year 326. to 373. and St. *Baſil*, who wrote about the Year 369. after examining, in his Letter to *Amphilochus*, the two oppoſite Practices, ſeems inclined to think the Baptiſm of Heretics null. According to the preſent Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, Baptiſm, by whomſoever adminiſtred, whether *Jew*, *Gentile*, Heretic, *Mohammedan*, &c. whether Man or Woman, or even a Child, is valid, provided it be only adminiſtred with an Intention of adminiſtring it, without which every Sacrament, ſay they, is null. This Doctrine, with reſpect to the Intention, proves daily to timorous Conſciences the Source of endleſs Doubts and Perplexities, which can never be removed: for tho' they may know for certain that the Ceremony was performed, yet they can never know whether or no it was performed with the due Intention. In Confeſſion, for Inſtance, they may hear the Words of the Abſolution pronounced by the Prieſt; but they know nothing of his Intention, of the Intention of the Miniſter who baptized him, of the Biſhop who ordained him, of the Prieſt, who baptized, or the Biſhops who ordained that Biſhop, and ſo up to the Apoſtles, by whom the firſt Biſhops were ordained. Should the right Intention have been wanting in any of theſe; ſhould the Prieſt, while he pronounces the Words of Abſolution, have his Thoughts employed on ſome other Object, as it may eaſily happen; the penitent Sinner would depart from his Tribunal with the whole Load of his Sins, and be damned, notwithſtanding his Repentance, for, or more properly ſpeaking, through want of Attention in the Prieſt. A moſt unchriſtian and impious Doctrine, placing our eternal Salvation in the Hands of others, and not in our own! 3. The Council decreed, that excommunicated Perſons ſhould be no-where abſolved from the Excommunication but in the Places where they had been excommunicated. The Biſhops of *Rome* did not yet know, it ſeems, that they were veſted with an unlimited Power of binding and looſening, of excommunicating and abſolving, with reſpect to all Perſons and Places; for had *Sylveſter* but dreamt of ſuch a Power, we may well ſuppoſe he would never have ſuffered it to be thus controuled. Several other Canons were made by this Council, in all Twenty-two; but it is foreign to my Purpoſe to take notice of them. I ſhall only obſerve, that the Council conſiſted of Thirty-three Biſhops, and not of Two hundred, as *Baronius* ſuppoſes, upon the Authority of St. *Auſtin*, whom he miſunderſtood; and that *Marinus* Biſhop of *Arles* preſided, his Name being placed at the Head of the Subſcriptions, and the Names of *Sylveſter*'s Legates after his.

(2) Leo, ep. 109.

but

but the Biſhop of the reigning City, ſays *Euſebius* [o], being prevented by his great Age from undertaking ſo long a Journey, he ſent *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, two *Roman* Presbyters, to ſupply his room [p], with Orders to agree in his Name to the Deciſions of the Council [q]. In Proceſs of Time ſuch Orders grew out of Date, and the modeſt Name of *Roman* Presbyters, given to thoſe who were ſent by the Biſhops of *Rome*, either to Councils or Princes, was changed into the lofty Title of *Legates a latere*. *Baronius* [r], and after him moſt Writers of the Church of *Rome*, maintain *Oſius*, the celebrated Biſhop of *Cordoua*, to have aſſiſted, nay, and preſided at the Council of *Nice* as the Pope's Legate. *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, ſay they, repreſented the Perſon of the Pope; but *Oſius* held his Place, and the Place of all the Biſhops of the Weſt. That *Oſius* aſſiſted at the Council with the Character of the Pope's Legate, is affirmed, I own, by *Gelaſius* of *Cyzicus*, who flouriſhed about the End of the Fifth Century [s]: but *Euſebius*, who was preſent, mentions only *Vitus* and *Vincentius* as ſent thither by *Sylveſter*. In like manner all the Hiſtorians, who have wrote of that Council after *Euſebius* till the Time of *Gelaſius*, in naming thoſe Two Presbyters and *Oſius*, which they all do, conſtantly diſtinguiſh the former by the Title of the Deputies, the Repreſentatives, *&c.* of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and never the latter. Beſides, *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, in ſubſcribing to the Canons of the Council, declare, that they do it *in the Name of the venerable Pope*, or Father, *Sylveſter their Biſhop* [t]; whereas *Oſius* ſubſcribes, like the other Biſhops, in his own Name. As to his preſiding at that great Aſſembly, his Name, 'tis true, is marked the firſt by *Socrates* [w], among thoſe who ſubſcribed to the Definitions and Canons of the Council; but yet I am inclined to believe that Honour not to have been conferred upon him, but upon *Euſtathius* Biſhop of *Antioch*; for *John*, Biſhop of the ſame City, writing to *Proculus* about the Year 453. ſtyles him the firſt of the Fathers aſſembled at *Nice* [x], and *Facundus* calls him the firſt of the Council [y]. In the Chronicle of *Nicephorus* he is ſtyled the Head of the Fathers of *Nice* [z]: and from *Theodoret* we learn, that he ſat the firſt on the Right-hand in the Aſſembly, and harangued the Emperor [a], which it was the Preſident's Province to do (B).

Oſius *did not aſſiſt at the Council of* Nice *as the Pope's Legate.*

Nor did he preſide.

[o] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 7. [p] Soz. p. 430. [q] Theodoret. l. 1. c. 6. [r] Bar. ad ann. 326. n. 20. [s] Gal. Cyz. de Nic. concil. l. 2. c. 5. p. 68. [t] Con. t. 2. p. 50. [w] Socr. l. 1. c. 23. [x] Facund. l. 8. c. 1. [y] Id. l. 2. c. 1. [z] Niceph. chron. [a] Theod. l. 1. c. 6.

(B) The Title of Preſident is given him in a Letter, which is commonly aſcribed to Pope *Felix* III (1). but I am well appriſed, that no great Streſs ſhould be laid on that Piece, ſince ſome ſurmiſe it to have been compoſed in the Eighth Century.

The Honour of presiding belonged of Right to *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*; but he, it seems, declined it, perhaps to obviate the Complaints of the *Arians*, who looked upon him as a Party concerned, and one highly prejudiced against them. I know that the haranguing of *Constantine* is ascribed to *Eusebius* the Historian in the Title of the Chapter in which he mentions it [b], that *Sozomen* positively affirms it, and that the learned *Valesius* thinks there is no room to doubt of it, since *Eusebius* was the most eloquent Bishop of those Times; and besides, he himself tells us, that he pronounced a Speech in Praise of *Constantine*, on occasion of his entering into the Twentieth Year of his Reign, while he was sitting in the midst of the Ministers of God [c]; meaning thereby, no doubt, the Bishops assembled at *Nice*. That *Eusebius* harangued the Emperor before that venerable Assembly, is not at all to be questioned; but that the Bishops, who composed it, should have pitched upon one who was suspected, or rather convicted of *Arianism*, to address the Emperor in their Name, at the Opening of the Council, seems to me highly improbable. The Orator, whoever he was, sat in the first Place, or at least in the second (that I may not quarrel with *Baronius*, who will have the Place on the Left-hand to have been the most honourable [d]): And what Right had the Bishop of *Cæsarea* to that Honour? I may add, that a short Compliment, such as is that which the Presbyter *Gregory* ascribes to *Eustathius* of *Antioch* [e], had been far more proper on that Occasion than *Eusebius*'s long and tedious Panegyric, which therefore some suppose to have been pronounced on Occasion of the magnificent Entertainment which *Constantine* gave the Bishops, as they were preparing to return to their respective Sees; for he then entered into the Twentieth Year of his Reign, which began on the 25th of *July* 325. and it was on that Occasion that *Eusebius* wrote, and delivered his Panegyric before the Emperor and the Fathers of the Council, as he himself declares [f]. To conclude, had *Eusebius* been appointed by that great Assembly to address the Emperor in their Name, his Modesty had not prevented him from describing the Spokesman so as to leave no room to doubt on whom that Honour had been conferred.

Eusebius of Cæsarea did not harangue the Emperor at the Opening of the Council,

But on another Occasion.

Before I dismiss this Subject, it may not be improper, nor foreign to my Purpose, to observe, that the Council of *Nice*, the first General

The Council of Nice not convened by the Pope.

[b] Euseb. in vit. Const. l. 3. c. 11. [c] Euseb. l. 1. c. 1. Vales. in not. p. 223. [d] Bar. ad ann. 325. n. 56—59. [e] Surius. 10 Jul. p. 159. [f] Euseb. vit. Const. l. 3. c. 14.

or

or Oecumenical Council held in the Church, was convened by the Emperor, and not by the Biſhop of *Rome*; that the Biſhop of *Rome* did not preſide in it either in Perſon, or by his Legates, as they are pleaſed to ſtyle them; and conſequently that the Privilege which they aſſumed in After-ages of aſſembling General Councils, and preſiding in them, ought to be deemed a moſt inſolent and unwarrantable Uſurpation.

The Council commands all Cauſes to be finally determined by Provincial Synods.

The Second Thing worthy of notice with reſpect to this Council is its Fifth Canon, commanding all Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes to be finally decided in each Province by a Provincial Synod. The Words of the Canon are clear in themſelves, and beſides have been underſtood in this Senſe by all the Councils that were held, by all the Authors that wrote, for ſeveral Ages after [g]; nay, it was underſtood in this Senſe by ſome of the Popes themſelves, namely, by *Innocent* I. who, in one of his Letters to *Victricius* Biſhop of *Roan*, writes thus; *If any Controverſy ſhould ariſe among the Clerks, whether they be of an inferior or ſuperior Rank, let it be decided, agreeably to the Council of* Nice, *in an Aſſembly of the Biſhops of the ſame Province* [h]. 'Tis true, he adds, *without prejudicing the Rights of the* Roman *See*. But that Reſtriction is his own, and not the Council's. Hence this Canon, directing all Cauſes to be thus tried, all Diſputes to be thus ended, was often quoted on occaſion of Appeals made to *Rome*, and employed as a Bulwark to reſtrain the incroaching Power of the Popes within due Bounds; but in proceſs of time their Ambition, ſupported by the Favour of Princes, and the great Temporalities they acquired, bore all down before them.

The Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy firſt formed.

It was in the Pontificate of *Sylveſter*, and under the benign Auſpices of *Conſtantine*, that the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy was firſt formed and ſettled in the Manner it continues to this Day; the new Form of Government, introduced by that Prince into the State, ſerving as a Model for the Government of the Church. In the Three firſt Centuries no other Hierarchy was known, no other Degrees thought of, but thoſe of Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons. Of theſe alone was compoſed the whole Body of the Clergy; but with this Difference, that the Biſhop or Superviſor was the general Diſpoſer and Manager of all Things within the Bounds of his Juriſdiction, nothing being done there without his Conſent and Approbation, and the Presbyters and Deacons

[g] Vide Elli. Du Pin de antiq. eccleſ. diſcip. p. 98. & ſeq.

[h] Inn. in epiſt. ad Vict. c. 3.

his Aſſiſtants, or his Counſellors and Senate, as St. *Jerom* [k], and before him St. *Ignatius* [l], ſtyled them. This Order was probably introduced, according to *Grotius* [m], in Imitation of the *Jewiſh* Synagogues; for each Synagogue had its Ruler, who preſided over the reſt, its Paſtors, and its Eleemoſynaries; to the Ruler ſucceeded the Biſhop, to the Paſtors the Presbyters, and to the Eleemoſynaries the Deacons.

The Office and Duty of Biſhops.

It was the Biſhop's Office and Duty to preach the Word [n], to pray with his People [o], to adminiſter the Sacraments [p], to ordain Miniſters [q], to excommunicate Offenders [r], to abſolve Penitents [s], and to regulate and ſettle every thing relating to his particular Church [t], with the Conſent and Concurrence of the Presbytery; for the Presbyters were his Counſellors or Senate, and, together with him, preſided in the Conſiſtories of thoſe Times, as we learn from *Tertullian* telling us, that in thoſe Courts *approved Elders preſided* [u]. Hence *Petrus de Marca* concludes the original Government of the Church to have been mixt of Monarchy and Ariſtocracy; or, to uſe his own Words, the Monarchical Government of the Church to have been tempered with the Ariſtocratical. As the Biſhop could not diſcharge, as he ought, the above-mentioned Functions, without reſiding among thoſe who were committed to his Care, his Reſidence was deemed abſolutely neceſſary, and Non-reſidence a moſt heinous Tranſgreſſion; inſomuch that St. *Cyprian*, enumerating the Sins that brought the Wrath of God upon the Church in the bloody Perſecution of *Decius*, mentions Non-reſidence in the Biſhops as one [w].

How choſen, and ordained

Upon the Vacancy of a See a new Biſhop was choſen in the room of the deceaſed in ſome Places by the Clergy and People of that Church alone, in others by the neighbouring Biſhops, the People and Clergy only expreſſing their Deſire, and giving Teſtimony of the Life and Manners of the Perſon propoſed, and in ſome by the joint Suffrages of the Clergy, of the People, and of the neighbouring Biſhops. Theſe three different Methods of electing we find practiſed at different Times with reſpect to the ſame Church; but on no Occaſion was the Choice of the neighbouring Biſhops ſufficient without the Conſent of the Clergy and People, nor the Election of the Clergy and People without the Approbation of the neighbouring Biſhops. The Biſhop being thus elected

[k] Hier. in c. 2. Iſai. [l] Vide Baſil. ep. 319. [m] Grot. de imp. ſumm. poteſt. c. 11. n. 8. [n] Orig. in Ezek. hom. 3. [o] Juſtin. apol. 2. p. 98. [p] Tert. de bapt. p. 602. [q] Idem ib. p. 99. [r] Cyp. ep. 38. p. 90. [s] Id. ep. 10. p. 30. [t] Tert. ib. p. 39. [u] Id. ib. p. 709. [w] Cyp. de lapſ. n. 4. p. 278.

and

and confirmed, he was in the next Place ordained; and this Ceremony was performed by the neighbouring Biſhops, in his own Church, and in the Preſence of his Flock, by the Impoſition of Hands. The new Biſhop, agreeably to a Cuſtom which obtained then, immediately gave notice of his Promotion to other Biſhops, eſpecially to thoſe of the greater Sees, who, by receiving and anſwering his Letters, were ſaid to communicate with him, and to acknowlege him lawfully choſen.

The Office and Duty of Presbyters.

In the Second Degree were the Presbyters or Prieſts, whoſe Office or Province it was to aſſiſt the Biſhop in the Diſcharge of his Paſtoral Commiſſion, whence they are often ſtyled the Biſhop's Aſſiſtants: with his Conſent and Approbation they preached the Word, they prayed with the People, they adminiſtred the Sacraments, they abſolved Penitents, and, in ſhort, diſcharged every Office which the Biſhop did, except thoſe of ordaining, confirming, and excommunicating; I ſay, with the Biſhop's Conſent and Approbation; for no ſpiritual Function could they perform without his Leave, as is manifeſt from *Tertullian* [x], *Origen* [y], St. *Cyprian* [z], and above all from St. *Ignatius*, in his famous Letter to the Church of *Smyrna* [a]. The Church, in thoſe happy Days, admitted none to the ſacred Functions, but ſuch as were known by a long Trial to be well qualified for ſo great a Charge. The Qualifications requiſite in a Presbyter, ſo far as I can learn from the Antients, may be reduced to theſe Four Heads, his Condition in the World, his Converſation, his Learning, and his Age. He was not to be intangled with any worldly Affairs, with any ſecular Employments, but at perfect Liberty to apply himſelf wholly to the Functions of his Office [b]. He was to be of an unſpotted and exemplary Life [c]; and therefore, before Ordination, he was propoſed to the Presbytery and People for their Teſtimony and Approbation. He was to be well verſed in the Scripture, and capable of teaching others, and inſtructing them in the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion. As for Human Learning, it was not required in a Presbyter; nay, by ſome it was condemned, particularly Logic and Philoſophy, as in a manner inconſiſtent with Chriſtianity [d], but at the ſame time highly commended and applauded by others as conducive to the right underſtanding of the Scripture, and neceſſary for confuting the So-

Qualifications requiſite in a Presbyter.

[x] Tertull. de bapt. p. 602. [y] Orig. hom. de Engaſt. vol. 1. p. 28. [z] Cyp. ep. 10. p. 29. ep. 11. p. 32. ep. 12. p. 37. [a] Ign. ad Smyrn. p. 6. [b] Cyp. ep. 66. p. 195. Tert. de præſcript. p. 89. [c] Idem ep. 68. p. 201. [d] Tert. adverſ. Hermog. p. 266. & de præſcript. p. 70, 71.

phiſms

phiſms of Heretics [e]; whence Logic eſpecially is recommended by *Clemens Alexandrinus* to all Eccleſiaſtics, as *a Hedge to defend the Truth from being trod down by Sophiſts* [f]. As for the Age of a Preſbyter, he was to be ſtricken in Years, as the very Name of a Presbyter or Elder ſufficiently declares. However, if a young Man was endowed with extraordinary Gifts and Talents, his Age was diſpenſed with in reſpect both to the Sacerdotal and Epiſcopal Dignity. Thus was *Aurelius*, though young in Years, raiſed, in regard of his great Merit, to the Rank of a Presbyter, as we read in St. *Cyprian* [g]; and the Biſhop of *Magneſia*, in St. *Ignatius*'s Time, was, it ſeems, but a young Man, ſince *Ignatius*, in his Letter to the *Magneſians*, exhorts them *not to deſpiſe their Biſhop's Age, but to yield him all due Reſpect and Reverence* [h]. Theſe were the Qualifications requiſite in a Candidate for the Miniſtry: if he was recommended by them (for no other Recommendation could avail him), he was admitted to holy Orders; if not, he was rejected as unfit for the ſacred Function. The Perſon ordained was at Liberty to ſerve the Church where he had received his Orders, or any other where his Aſſiſtance might be wanted; for he was not ordained Miniſter of any particular Church, but of the Church univerſal.

The Inſtitution and Office of Deacons.

In the Third and laſt Degree were the Deacons, whoſe original Inſtitution was to *ſerve Tables*, as we read in the *Acts* [i]; that is, to inſpect the Poor, and relieve them by a proper Diſtribution of the Offerings made by the Faithful, which were committed to their Charge, though they could not diſpoſe of them without the Biſhop's Knowlege [k]. They were ordained by the Impoſition of Hands [l], and therefore deemed Miniſters of the Altar, as well as Diſpenſers of Alms; and with a great deal of Reaſon, for they aſſiſted the Biſhops or Preſbyters in adminiſtring the Euchariſt, by delivering the Elements to the Communicants [m]; they carried the Euchariſt to ſuch as had not been able to aſſiſt with the reſt at Divine Service [n]; they preached, and, in the Abſence of the Biſhop and Presbyters, conferred the Sacrament of Baptiſm [o]. The Presbyters of a Church were not confined to a ſet Number; but the Deacons were, no Church having more than Seven

Their Number.

[e] Orig. contra Celſ. l. 6. p. 279. Clem. Alex. ſtrom. l. 1. p. 207. l. 6. p. 472, &c. [f] Clem. Alex. ſtrom. l. 6. p. 472. [g] Cyp. ep. 33. p. 76. [h] Ign. ep. ad Magneſ. p. 31. [i] Acts vi. 1, 2, 3, 4. [k] Conſt. Apoſt. l. 2. p. 31, 32. [l] Acts vi. 6. [m] Juſt. apol. 2. p. 97. [n] Idem ib. p. 98. [o] Tert. de bapt. p. 602.

in

in the primitive Times, that being the original Number inſtituted by the Apoſtles. Thus the Church of *Rome* had but Seven in the Times of Pope *Cornelius* [p], and Pope *Sixtus* II [q]. the Church of *Saragoſa* the ſame Number in the Time of *Vincentius*, who flouriſhed under *Diocleſian* [r]. The Fourteenth Canon of the Council of *Neocæſarea*, or the Fifteenth, according to the *Greek*, forbids this Number to be inlarged, even in the greateſt and moſt populous Cities [s]; whence St. *Jerom* writes, that great Reſpect was paid to the Deacons, becauſe they were few in Number [t].

Subdeacons, Acolytes, Readers, &c.

As for the Subdeacons, Acolytes, Lectors, Janitors, and Exorciſts, they were not conſidered as any-ways belonging to the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy, being employed only in the meaner Offices of the Church, by the due Diſcharge of which they were to give Proof of their Integrity and Attention, in order to be raiſed to a higher Degree; for in thoſe Days very few, and none but upon ſome very extraordinary Occaſion, arrived at once, or, as they call it, *per ſaltum*, at the Epicopal Dignity.

Each Church independent.

During the Three firſt Centuries each Church was in a manner independent, that is, could make ſuch Regulations relating to its Diſcipline and Government as were judged proper and expedient, without the Concurrence and Authority of other Churches [u]. However, in all Matters of Moment, the Biſhops uſed to adviſe with one another, eſpecially with thoſe of the ſame Province, who frequently met to ſettle all Eccleſiaſtical Affairs within their reſpective Limits. *Firmilian* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, in *Cappadocia*, writes, that in his Province they met every Year [w]; and from the frequent Synods mentioned by St. *Cyprian*, we may conclude them to have been held in that Province at leaſt once a Year. Theſe Synods or Aſſemblies were compoſed of Biſhops, Presbyters, Deacons, and Laymen, repreſenting the People of their ſeveral Churches [x]. They met by their own Appointment and Authority, there being no Chriſtian Magiſtrates in thoſe Days to convene Synods. Being thus aſſembled, they choſe in the firſt place one, and ſometimes two Biſhops, to preſide [y]. It was their Office and Duty to ſee the Point in queſtion calmly and fairly debated, to ſum up in each Debate what had been urged on both Sides, to take

Frequent Synods held.

Of whom compoſed.

The Method they held.

[p] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 43. [q] Prud. de coron. mar. p. 71. [r] Idem ib. p. 91. [s] Conc. t. 1. p. 1448. [t] Hier. ep. 85. [u] Cyp. ep. 55, 72, 52. [w] Apud Cyp. ep. 75. [x] Cyp. ep. 14, 26, 31. Euſeb. l. 5. c. 16. & l. 7. c. 30. Act. Concil. Carth. apud Cyp. p. 443. [y] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 23, & 24.

the

the Votes and Suffrages of the Members of the Synod, and laſt of all to give their own [z]. In theſe Aſſemblies all Eccleſiaſtical Affairs were ſettled by the Majority of Votes, and their Decrees and Deciſions were binding with reſpect to thoſe Churches whoſe Repreſentatives were preſent [a]; but were not ſo with reſpect to other Churches.

The Eccleſiaſtical Polity adapted to the Civil.

Such was the Hierarchy, ſuch the Government of the Church, during the Three firſt Centuries. But in the Fourth and following Ages great Alterations were made in both, the Church adapting her Government to that of the State, namely, to the new Form of Government introduced by *Conſtantine*, who had ſettled her in Peace, and taken the Prieſthood into his immediate Protection. For it was in his Reign that the Titles of *Patriarchs*, *Exarchs*, *Metropolitans*, were firſt heard of, or at leaſt had any Power, Authority, or Privileges, annexed to them. That this Conformity between the Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Polity may appear more plainly, I ſhall premiſe a ſuccinct Account of the former, as eſtabliſhed by *Conſtantine* throughout the Empire. That Prince divided the whole *Roman* World into Four Prefectures, *viz.* the *Eaſt*, *Illyricum*, *Gaul*, and *Italy*, which were governed by Four Prefects, called *Præfecti Prætorio*. Till his Time the whole Empire was governed under the Emperors by Two Prefects only, as *Zoſimus* informs us [b]; and this Diviſion is ſuppoſed to have been made by *Conſtantine*, jealous of the too great Power of thoſe Magiſtrates. Each Prefecture was ſubdivided into ſeveral Dioceſes, and each Dioceſe into ſeveral Provinces. Thus the Prefecture of the *Eaſt* contained Five Dioceſes; *viz.* the *Eaſt* divided into Ten Provinces, *Egypt* into Six, *Pontus* into Eleven, *Aſia* into Ten, and *Thrace* into Six. Under the Prefecture of *Illyricum* were Two Dioceſes; *Macedon*, conſiſting of Eight Provinces, and *Dacia*, conſiſting of Four. The Prefecture of *Gaul* compriſed Three Dioceſes, *Gaul* made up of Seventeen Provinces, *Spain* of Seven, and *Britain* of Five. The Prefecture of *Italy* was divided into Two Vicarages or Lieutenances; the one of *Rome*, comprehending Ten Provinces, under the Vicar of *Rome*, whence they were called *Suburbicarian* Provinces; the other of *Italy*, containing Seven Provinces, governed by the Vicar of *Italy*, who reſided at *Milan*, whence they were ſimply called Provinces of *Italy*. Under the Prefect of *Italy* was likewiſe *Weſt Africa*, and after *Conſtantine*'s Death *Weſt Illyricum*. The Prefects had other Officers under them, by whom the Provinces were more immediately governed.

The new Form of Government introduced by Conſtantine.

[z] Act. Concil. Carth. apud. p. 443. [a] Cyp. ep. 59 [b] Zoz. l. 2. p. 623.

Theſe

Theſe were, to name them according to their Rank and Dignity, Proconſuls, Vicars, Conſulars, Correctors, and Preſidents. Each Dioceſe had its Metropolis, and likewiſe each Province contained in the Dioceſe.

The Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Polity compared.

Now, if we compare the Civil Polity, thus deſcribed, with the Eccleſiaſtical, we ſhall find them in moſt Places anſwering each other in every reſpect, and one Biſhop raiſed above the reſt, according to the Rank that was given by this new Diviſion to the City in which he preſided. Thus, for Inſtance, the chief Cities of the Five Dioceſes of the Oriental Prefecture were; *Antioch*, the Metropolis of the Oriental Dioceſe; *Alexandria*, of the *Egyptian*; *Epheſus*, of the *Aſiatic*; *Cæſarea*, of the *Pontic*; and *Heraclea*, of the *Thracian*. Now the Biſhops of theſe Cities, in regard of the Eminence of their Sees, were exalted above all other Biſhops, and diſtinguiſhed with the Title of Exarchs; nay, and by Degrees they acquired, not to ſay uſurped, a kind of Authority and Juriſdiction over the Biſhops of the inferior Sees, which was afterwards confirmed to them by ſeveral Councils. In like manner the Biſhop of the Metropolis of each Province was, on account of the Dignity of his See, honoured with the Title of Metropolitan, to which were annexed ſeveral Privileges, of which I ſhall ſpeak hereafter. When one Province was divided into Two, which often happened, the Eccleſiaſtical Polity was likewiſe altered, and the Biſhop of the new Metropolis raiſed to the Dignity of a Metropolitan. Several Inſtances might be alleged of ambitious Biſhops applying to the Emperors for a Diviſion of the Province, that their City might acquire the Title of Metropolis, and they, of courſe, that of Metropolitans. When the City of *Byzantium* was declared the Metropolis of another Empire, the Exarchate of *Heraclea*, the Metropolis of the *Thracian* Dioceſe, was, by that Change, transferred from *Hieraclea* to the new Metropolis; ſo that the Biſhop of *Heraclea* became Suffragan to the Biſhop of *Byzantium*, or, as it was then called, *Conſtantinople*, who, till that Time, had been Suffragan to him. Upon the Diviſion of a Province, the Churches were likewiſe divided, and the Biſhop of the new Metropolis acquired all the Privileges and Power of a Metropolitan over the Churches taken by the Change in the Civil Government from the antient Metropolis. But it was afterwards decreed, by the Council of *Chalcedon*, that if any City ſhould be raiſed to the Dignity of a Metropolis, the Biſhop of that City ſhould enjoy the Title, but not the Privileges of a Metropolitan. Thus the Biſhops of *Nice* and *Berytus* were honoured with the Title of Metropolitans, and took Place

of all the other Biſhops of thoſe Provinces; but nevertheleſs continued to be Suffragans to their antient Metropolitans the Biſhops of *Nicomedia* and *Tyre*. For the ſame Reaſon ſeveral Biſhops in the Kingdom of *Naples* enjoy, to this Day, the Title of Metropolitans; but neither have, nor ever had, any Province or Suffragans. The above-mentioned Decree was enacted by the Council of *Chalcedon*, to prevent the Biſhops from recurring, as they often did, to the Emperors, and to obviate the frequent Changes that were thereby introduced into the Church.

The Perfectures of Illyricum, Gaul, *and* Spain.

The Prefecture of *Illyricum* had but one Exarch, the Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, the Metropolis of the *Macedonian* Dioceſe. In the Prefecture of *Gaul* there was no Exarch, but in the Two Dioceſes of *Gaul* and *Spain* as many Metropolitans as Provinces. Some there were, without all Doubt, in the Dioceſe of *Britain*, which was divided into Five Provinces, *viz. Maxima Cæſarienſis*, *Britannia Prima*, *Britannia Secunda*, *Valentia*, and *Flavia Cæſarienſis*. But in this Iſland an intire Change was made, by the *Saxons*, both in the Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Polity.

The Perfecture of Italy.

Under the Prefect of *Italy* were Three Dioceſes, *viz. Italy*, *Weſt Illyricum*, and *Weſt Africa*. The Dioceſe of *Italy* was divided into Two Vicarages, as I have obſerved above, and governed by Two Vicars; the one called the Vicar of *Rome*, and reſiding in that City, the other ſtyled the Vicar of *Italy*, and reſiding at *Milan*. Under the former were Ten Provinces, *viz. Campania*, *Apulia*, *Lucania*, *Hetruria*, *Umbria*, *Picenum Suburbicarium*, *Sicily*, *Sardinia*, *Corſica*, and *Valeria*; and Seven under the latter, *viz. Liguria*, *Æmilia*, *Flaminia* or *Picenum Annonarium*, *Venetia*, *Iſtria*, *Alpes Cottiæ*, and the Two *Rhætiæ*. Such was the Civil Government of *Italy*, and intirely agreeable to the Civil was the Eccleſiaſtical. Thus the Biſhop of *Rome* enjoyed all the Privileges of a Metropolitan, with reſpect to the Biſhops of the Provinces ſubject to the Vicar of that City, or the *Suburbicarian* Provinces, as they are ſtyled by *Ruffinus*. In like manner the Biſhop of *Milan* exerciſed the Power and Authority of a Metropolitan over all the Biſhops under the Vicar of *Italy*. But the Power of both was confined within the Limits of their reſpective Vicarages. As neither had the Charge of a whole Dioceſe, they were not, like ſeveral Biſhops in the Eaſt, diſtinguiſhed with the Title of Exarch, which they had no Right to, but with that only of Metropolitan. However, the Power of the Biſhop of *Rome* far exceeded, within the Bounds of his Juriſdiction, that of other Metropolitans, as I ſhall ſhew hereafter.

The Eccleſiaſtical Polity there intirely agreeable to the Civil.

In

In *Africa* the Eccleſiaſtical Polity varied greatly from the Civil. *Carthage* indeed, in the Proconſular Province of *Africa*, properly ſo called, was the Metropolis of all *Weſt Africa*, and the Biſhop of that City the Primate and Exarch. But in the other Five Provinces of that Dioceſe, *viz.* *Numidia*, the Two *Mauritanias*, *Cæſarienſis* and *Sitifenſis*, *Tingitana*, *Bizacena*, and *Tripolitana*, the ſenior Biſhop, in what City ſoever he preſided, enjoyed the Title and Privileges of Metropolitan, Regard being had to his Seniority, or the Time of his Ordination, and none to the Dignity of his See. And hence it is that, at different times, we find Biſhops of different Cities, within the ſame Province, acting as *Metropolitans*. Of *Weſt Illyricum*, the Third Dioceſe under the Prefect of *Italy*, I ſhall have Occaſion to ſpeak hereafter. *The Eccleſiaſtical Polity in* Africa.

Some Writers, namely, *Petrus de Marca*, Archbiſhop of *Paris* [c], *Chriſtianus Lupus* [d], *Emmanuel Schelſtrat* [e], Two eminent Divines, the one of *Louvain*, the other of *Antwerp*, and *Leo Allatius* [f], have taken a great deal of Pains to prove, that theſe Eccleſiaſtical Dignities owe their Origin to *Chriſt*, or the Apoſtles. But their Arguments are unanſwerably confuted by the learned *Ellies du Pin* [g]; and, beſides, it is evident, from the intire Conformity which the Eccleſiaſtical Government had, in moſt Places, with the Political State of the Empire, as eſtabliſhed by *Conſtantine*, that the Church in forming the Hierarchy I have deſcribed, adopted his Plan; and conſequently, that ſuch Dignities are not of divine, but of human Inſtitution. I might add, that it cannot be proved from Scripture, that the Apoſtles, in appointing Biſhops, gave more Power to one than to another, or any Power at all to one over the others. *The Dignities of* Exarchs, Metropolitans, &c. *not of divine Inſtitution.*

The new Dignities or Degrees, added to the antient Hierarchy of the Church, in the Fourth and following Centuries, were thoſe of *Metropolitan*, *Primate*, *Archbiſhop*, *Exarch*, and *Patriarch*. The Title of *Metropolitan* was given to the Biſhop of the chief City of a Province, and likewiſe that of *Primate*, he being *primus*, or the firſt of the Province; for ſuch was the original Signification of that Word in an eccleſiaſtical Senſe; but, in Proceſs of Time, the Title of *Primate* was reſtrained to the Biſhops of ſome great Cities. On the contrary the Title of *Archbiſhop* was originally beſtowed on Metro- *The new Dignities added to the antient Hierarchy of the Church.*

[c] Pet. de Mar. l. 6. de conc. c. 1. [d] Lup. can. 4. Nic. par. 1. [e] Schel. antiq. illuſt. part. 1. diſſer. 1. c. 3. art. 1. [f] Leo All. de eccl. occid. & orient. conſeſ. l. 1. c. 2. [g] Du Pin de antiq. eccleſ. diſcip. diſſ. 1. n. 6.

politans only of great Eminence and Distinction; but, in the Eighth Century, it began to be given indifferently to all Metropolitans, and even to some Bishops, distinguished by no other Title. As the Bishop of the Metropolis, or chief City, of a Province, was dignified with the Title of *Metropolitan*, so was the Bishop of the Metropolis, or chief City of a Diocese, with that of *Exarch*; which, however, we find sometimes given to Metropolitans. As for the Title of *Patriarch*, it was first common to all Bishops, but afterwards confined to the Exarchs; and lastly, to the Bishops of the Five following Cities, *viz.* *Rome*, *Constantinople*, *Antioch*, *Alexandria*, and *Jerusalem*. It was first bestowed on the Bishop of *Rome*, by the Council of *Chalcedon* [h], after it had been long common to all the Exarchs of the East, as the learned *Du Pin* well observes [i].

The Rights and Privileges of Metropolitans.

The Titles of Metropolitans, Primates, Exarchs, and Patriarchs, were not bare Names of Honour, but had several Rights and Prerogatives attending them. Thus the Metropolitans and Primates had, by their Prerogative, a Right to ordain the Bishops of their respective Provinces, to convene provincial Synods, and to have a general Superintendency or Inspection over the whole Province. The ordaining of Bishops was a Privilege common to the Metropolitan, with the other Bishops of the same Province; but with this Difference, that the Presence, or at least the Consent and Approbation of the Metropolitan was absolutely necessary; for, according to the Fourth and Sixth Canons of the Council of *Nice*, *who was not ordained, or approved, by the Metropolitan, was not to be a Bishop*. This Privilege was confirmed to the Metropolitans by many subsequent Councils, namely, by those of *Arles*, *Laodicea*, *Carthage*, *Chalcedon*, *Ephesus* [k], and many others. However, in the Fifth Century, the Patriarchs of *Alexandria* and *Constantinople* began, in the East, to usurp this Prerogative, pretending, that no Bishops ought to be ordained in their respective Dioceses, without their Knowlege, Consent, and Approbation; and the Patriarch of *Rome*, still more ambitious and encroaching, claimed a Right to ordain the Bishops throughout all the Provinces of the West, which occasioned endless Disputes, as we shall see in the Sequel of this History. As to the Second Privilege peculiar to the Metropolitans, they had a Right to summon the

[h] Concil. t. 4. col. 58. Evagr. l. 2. c. 18. [i] Du Pin, c. 6. n. 5. [k] Conc. Arel. can. 50. Laod. can. 12. Carth. can. 12. Eph. act, 4. &c.

Bishops

Biſhops of their reſpective Provinces to meet when they thought proper; to appoint the Time and Place of their Meeting; to puniſh ſuch as did not, without juſt Cauſe, comply with their Summons; and to preſide in the Aſſembly. The general Care and Inſpection, which they were charged with over the whole Province, imported, Firſt, That all Complaints againſt, all Conteſts with or between the Biſhops of the Province, were to be brought to their Tribunal; and there heard, judged, and determined, not by the Metropolitan alone, but by him and the other Biſhops of the Province, in a Provincial Synod. Innumerable Inſtances might be alleged of Biſhops thus depoſed by their Metropolitans. Secondly, The Metropolitans had a Right to receive Appeals from the Sentence of inferior Biſhops, and, with the other Biſhops, to confirm or reverſe their Decrees. And, laſtly, each Metropolitan was to keep a watchful Eye over the Biſhops of his Province, and take care that they diſcharged, as they ought, the Functions of their Office. Theſe Privileges were, in expreſs Terms, granted to the Metropolitans, by almoſt innumerable Councils, which it is needleſs, and would be too tedious, to name.

The Rights and Privileges of Patriarchs, or Exarchs.

As for the Patriarchs, or Exarchs; by their Prerogative, they were impowered to ordain the Metropolitans, to convene Dioceſan Synods, and to have a general Superintendency over their reſpective Dioceſes, ſuch as the Metropolitans had over their reſpective Provinces. The Biſhop of *Rome* had not the Charge of a whole Dioceſe, and therefore was not, properly ſpeaking, Exarch or Patriarch: his Juriſdiction did not extend beyond the Limits of the Vicarage of *Rome*, or the Suburbicarian Provinces; and no Inſtance can be produced of Metropolitans or Biſhops ordained by him, out of thoſe Provinces, till the Time of *Valentinian* III. Even in the Vicarage of *Italy* the Metropolitan of each Province ordained all the Biſhops, and were themſelves ordained by the Biſhops of the Province. But over the Suburbicarian Provinces the Biſhop of *Rome* exerciſed greater Power and Authority, than the Exarchs of the Eaſt did over the Provinces of their Dioceſes; for the latter left the Ordination of the Biſhops to their Metropolitans, whereas the former ordained not only the Biſhops of the metropolitan Cities, but all thoſe of the fore-mentioned Provinces: and the Reaſon of this was, becauſe theſe Provinces had no Metropolitans, to whom the Ordination of Biſhops would of Right have belonged; ſo that the Prerogatives of the Metropolitans were all veſted in the Biſhop of *Rome* alone. As there were no Exarchs

The Biſhop of Rome *not a Patriarch.*

or

or Patriarchs in the West, the Bishops of each Province were, by several Councils, vested with the Power of ordaining their own Metropolitans; and that they were thus ordained in *Gaul*, *Spain*, and *West Africa*, is so manifest as to admit of no Dispute [k]. And yet the Sticklers for the See of *Rome* pretend the Bishops of that City to have a divine and inherent Right of ordaining all the Metropolitans throughout the Christian World, by themselves, their Vicars, or Delegates. To maintain this chimerical Right against the uncontestable Evidence of Facts, they tell us, that the Popes, for some Ages, neglected to exert the Power they had [l]. But from this Charge all Mankind will clear them, it being but too well known, that they never neglected the least Opportunity of exerting to the utmost the Power they had, and usurping the Power they had not. But, Cavils aside, it is evident beyond Dispute, that the Popes never knew, nor dreamt of, any such Right or Prerogative, till they were told of it by their flattering Divines; at least Pope *Leo*, surnamed *the Great*, did not; for in one of his Letters to the Bishops of *Gaul* he disclaims, in expres Terms, the Right of ordaining the Bishops of that Diocese [m]. To conclude, the Bishop of *Rome* was the only Metropolitan in that Vicarage; and, as such, had a Right to ordain all the Bishops of the Suburbicarian Provinces, or the Provinces subject to the Vicar of *Rome*; but, for a considerable Tract of Time, there is no Instance of their ordaining either Bishops or Metropolitans out of that District.

The Bishops of Rome *have no Right to ordain the Metropolitans.*

As for the Title of Archbishop, it is in itself a bare Name of Honour; whence, in some Countries, especially in *Italy*, several are distinguished with that Title, who indeed take Place of, but have no Power or Authority over, other Bishops. And thus far of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, as settled in the Fourth and following Centuries, of the different Degrees that compose it, and the Prerogatives peculiar to each Degree, the Knowlege whereof is absolutely necessary for the right Understanding of the many Contests and Disputes in point of Jurisdiction, which I shall have Occasion to touch upon in the Sequel of this History; for it was not at once, but by Degrees, and not without great Opposition, that the Bishops of *Rome*, extending their Authority beyond the Limits of that Vicarage, which was at that time the Boundary of their Jurisdiction, acquired the unlimited Power they now enjoy, with the arrogant Title of *Universal Bishop*.

The Title of Archbishop *in itself a bare Name of Honour.*

[k] Vide Du Pin dissert. 1. n. 13. [l] Idem ib. [m] Leo, ep. 89.

But to return to *Sylveſter*, in whoſe Pontificate this great Change began; I need not employ many Words to ſhew the Forgery of the ſo much boaſted Donation of all *Italy*, ſuppoſed to have been made by *Conſtantine* to *Sylveſter*, in the Spring of the Year 324. Four Days after he had been baptized by that Pontiff, ſince the Inſtrument of that Donation is now looked upon as ſuppoſititious, by all who have the leaſt Tincture of Learning. The Arguments they allege againſt it are: 1. That more than Twelve Copies of that Inſtrument are ſtill extant, all differing from one another. 2. That it evidently appears, from Two Conſtitutions of *Conſtantine*, ſtill to be ſeen in the *Theodoſian* Code [m], that he was not at *Rome*, but at *Theſſalonica*, in the Spring of the Year 324. 3. That neither *Euſebius*, who has given us a very minute and particular Account of the Actions of that Prince, nor any other cotemporary Writer, has ſo much as hinted at ſo memorable a Fact. 4. That all the antient Writers, both *Greek* and *Latin*, agree, that *Conſtantine* was not baptized at *Rome*, but at *Nicodemia*, when he lay at the Point of Death [n]. Let thoſe, who ſtand up in Defence of that Donation, give ſatisfactory Anſwers to theſe Reaſons, and I ſhall conclude with them, that *Italy* being, by ſuch a Donation, disjoined from the Empire, the Emperors who ſucceeded *Conſtantine*, had no Claim or Title to that Country; that none of their Conſtitutions were binding there; and conſequently that, by the Inhabitants of *Italy*, Recourſe ought to be had, in all Caſes, not to the Civil, but to the Canon Law: for ſuch pernicious Doctrines have been broached, publiſhed, and maintained, as natural Deductions from *Conſtantine*'s great Generoſity to *Sylveſter* [o]. In *Rome* is ſtill to be ſeen, in a moſt ſumptuous Chapel, cloſe to the *Lateran*, the Baptiſtery or Font in which *Conſtantine* is ſaid to have been baptized. The Chapel is adorned with noble Paintings, repreſenting that auguſt Ceremony, as performed by *Sylveſter*, in the magnificent Drapery, and ſtately Apparel, of the preſent Popes. Four Days after this Ceremony, *Conſtantine*, ſenſible of his Obligations to *Sylveſter*, rewarded him for his Trouble with a Fee, as *Lucheſini* the *Scolopian* expreſſes it, anſwering in ſome Degree to the Greatneſs of the Favour he had received at his Hands; a Fee worthy of ſo great a

The Donation of all Italy *made by* Conſtantine *to the Pope, a Forgery.*

[m] Cod. Theod. l. 4. de navicul. & l. un. de his qui veniam ætat. [n] Vide Petr. de Marca, l. 3. c. 12. l. 6. c. 6. Schelſtrat. antiq. illuſtr. par. 2. diſſert. 3. c. 8. Got. in chron. cod. Theod. ann. 324. Euſeb. vit. Conſt. l. 4. c. 61. [o] Afflict. in conſtit. in prælud. quæſt. 2. n. 2. & q. 20. n. 1. Tappia de jur. regni, l. 1. & de leg. l. 1. n. 6. Ponte de poteſt. Proreg. tit. 11. n. 26.

Prince,

Prince, of so great a Pope [p]. The Fee, which that Writer, otherwise a Man of Learning, makes a long and tedious Descant upon, was no less than the City of *Rome*, and all *Italy*. That *Constantine* was baptized at *Nicomedia*, and not at *Rome*, is affirmed, in express Terms, by *Theodoret* [q], *Sozomen* [r], *Socrates* [s], and *Photius* [t], among the *Greeks*; and, among the *Latins*, by St. *Ambrose* [u], St. *Jerom* [w], and the Council of *Rimini* [x]. *Emanuel Schelstrat*, on one Side, ashamed to reject, or even to question, such Authorities, but, on the other, unwilling to rob *Sylvester* of that Glory, will have *Constantine* to have been baptized in both Places. It is well known, says he, that *Constantine*, in the Latter-end of his Life, was greatly biassed in favour of the *Arians*, and their Tenets. Now a Practice obtained among them of rebaptizing such as came over to their Sect from the Catholic Church; and, to conform to this Custom, *Constantine* was, in all Likelihood, prevailed upon by *Eusebius*, the *Arian* Bishop of *Nicomedia*, who assisted him on his Death-bed [y]. Thus *Schelstrat*. But it is certain that, in *Constantine*'s Time, the *Arians* allowed the Validity of Baptism administred by the Catholics; for, long after, we find St. *Austin* upbraiding them with the Practice of rebaptizing, as a Novelty lately introduced among them [z]. Besides, who is so little versed in the History of the Church, as not to know, that, in those early Times, a very bad Custom universally prevailed, at least, among Persons of Distinction, who embraced the Christian Religion, namely, that of putting off their Baptism to their Death-bed, or till they were upon the Point of exposing themselves to some great Danger? Thus *Theodosius the Great*, though he had not only openly professed the Christian Religion, but given many Instances of an extraordinary Piety, yet did not chuse to be baptized till he fell dangerously ill at *Thessalonica* [a]. In like manner *Valentinian* II. delayed his Baptism till the Approach of a Battle with the Barbarians, when he sent, in great Haste, for St. *Ambrose* to administer that Sacrament to him. But while the good Bishop was crossing the *Alps*, on his Way to *Vienne*, where the Emperor then was, he received the melancholy News of his having been inhumanly murdered by some of his own Officers, at the Instigation of *Arbogastus*. His Death was greatly

Constantine *baptized at* Nicomedia, *and not at* Rome.

[p] Luch. de imp. potest. in Ital. [q] Theod. l. 1. c. 32. [r] Soz. l. 2. c. 34. [s] Socr. l. 1. c. 39. [t] Phot. cod. 127. [u] Ambros. serm. de obitu Theodos. [w] Hier. in chron. [x] Soz. l. 4. c. 18. [y] Schelst. antiq. illust. part. 2. differt. 3. c. 6. [z] Aug. de hæres. c. 48. [a] Socr. l. 5. c. 6. Sozom. l. 7. c. 4.

lamented

lamented by St. *Ambroſe*, who, in the elegant Oration, which he pronounced on Occaſion of his Obſequies, maintained, that the fervent Deſire of Baptiſm had the ſame Effect as the Sacrament itſelf; and conſequently, that the Sins of the deceaſed Prince being thereby cancelled, it was not to be doubted, but from this Life he had paſſed to eternal Bliſs [b]. Innumerable Inſtances of the ſame Nature occur in Hiſtory, which were, it ſeems, utterly unknown to the Author of the Acts of Pope *Sylveſter*, upon whoſe ſole Authority the Fable has been credited of *Conſtantine*'s receiving Baptiſm at the Hands of *Sylveſter*, ſoon after his Converſion. That Impoſtor, whoever he was, is ſuppoſed to have lived in the Eighth Century, long after the Cuſtom of deferring Baptiſm to the Point of Death had been utterly aboliſhed. What gave Countenance to ſuch a Cuſtom, was an Opinion then generally received, and ſtill held by the Church of *Rome*; *viz.* That by the Waters of the ſacred Font Men were waſhed clean, not only from the original, but from all other Sins. This proved a great Encouragement to Vice when Piety began (and it began but too early) to decay among Chriſtians; and therefore the Fathers of the Church, eſpecially *Baſil*, his Brother *Gregory* of *Nyſſa*, and St. *Ambroſe* [c], employed all the Oratory they were Maſters of, in crying down ſuch a pernicious and wicked Cuſtom, as they ſtyle it; ſo that it was at laſt quite laid aſide. Whether Confeſſion ought not, on the ſame Account, to be put down, I ſhall leave the Reader to judge; and only obſerve here, by the way, that had the Virtue and Efficacy, aſcribed now to Confeſſion, been known in thoſe Times, Sinners needed not have delayed Baptiſm to the Point of Death, ſince their Sins had been no leſs effectually cancelled by Confeſſion, than by Baptiſm.

What gave Countenance to the Cuſtom of deferring Baptiſm to the Point of Death.

As for the Letter from the Council of *Nice* to *Sylveſter*, his Anſwer, the Acts of a Council of 275 Biſhops, ſuppoſed to have been held by him, at the Requeſt of the Fathers of *Nice*, to confirm their Canons and Decrees (C), his Letter to the Biſhops of *Gaul*, in favour

Spurious Pieces aſcribed to Sylveſter.

[b] Amb. orat. in fun. Val. & alibi.

[c] Greg. in orat. de bapt. Amb. in ſer. de ſanct.

of

(C) The Style of the Letter from the Council to *Sylveſter* is quite barbarous and unintelligible. It begins thus: *Gloriam corroborata de Divinis Myſteriis. Eccleſiaſticæ utilitatis quæ ad robur pertinent Eccleſiæ Catholicæ & Apoſtolicæ ad ſedem tuam* Romanam *explanata & de Græco redacta ſcribere confitemur—Nunc itaque ad veſtræ ſedis argumentum accurrimus roborari.* The reſt is written in the ſame Style; the Conſuls are called *Sovereigns*, and the Letter is dated Five or Six Days after the Opening of the Council. The Deſign of the Impoſtor was, to make the Fathers of *Nice* recur

of the Church of *Vienne*; the Acts of Two other Councils, said to have been held by him at *Rome*, they are all Pieces universally rejected by Men of Learning, and deemed no less fabulous than the Instrument of *Constantine*'s Donation, and that Prince's Journey with *Sylvester* to the Council of *Nice*, as it is related in the Acts of the latter, even in those which *F. Combefis* published in 1660. They are in *Greek*, and that Writer undertakes to defend them as genuine [d]; but we need no other Proof than the Account they give of that Journey, to conclude them incapable of being defended. *Sylvester* died on the 31st of *December* 335. after having governed the Church of *Rome* for the Space of Twenty-one Years and Eleven Months [e].

CONSTANTINE.

MARK,

Thirty-third BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 336.

SYLVESTER was succeeded by *Mark*, on the 18th of *January* 336. He is passed over by *Theodoret* [f], but named by *Optatus* [g], *Ruffinus* [h], St. *Austin* [i], St. *Jerom* [k], and *Sozomen* [l]. We know nothing

[d] Comb. act. &c. p. 258. [e] Buch. cycl. p. 267, 273. [f] Theod. l. 2. c. 12. [g] Opt. l. 2. p. 48. [h] Ruffin. l. 10. c. 22. [i] Aug. ep. 165. [k] Hier. chron. [l] Soz. l. 2. c. 20.

recur to *Sylvester* for a Confirmation of their Decrees. *Sylvester*'s Answer is of a piece with the Letter of the Council; it supposes him to have added something to the Council; mentions the Cycle of *Victorinus*, who was not born in *Sylvester*'s Time, nor many Years after; and bears a false Date. As for the Council said, and by some still maintained, to have been held at *Rome*, to confirm the Canons of *Nice*, it was utterly unknown to all the Antients. And who can believe that none of the Antients should ever have heard of a Council held in the Metropolis of the Empire, and consisting, as we are told, of Two hundred and Seventy-five Bishops, or, if they had heard of it, that they would never have mentioned it? Besides, it is said to have been held at *Rome*, in the Presence of *Constantine*; and it is certain, that the Emperor was not in *Rome* at the Time the Council is supposed to have been held. The Canons, which are supposed to have been made on this Occasion, contain Regulations repugnant to the Practice of those Times, and which it was then impossible to observe. The first Canon relates to the Time when *Easter* was to be kept; but what is there determined no Man can know. The Second is no less unintelligible than the First: *Ut unusquisque Episcopus rediens ad Parochiam suam Compaginem Salutationis plebi tuæ innotescat.* These are the Words of this Canon. The Third forbids the Ecclesiastics to appear before secular Judges, let the Action be what it will; which is repugnant to the Discipline of those Times. The Fourth will have those, who enter themselves among the Clergy, to pass through all the Degrees, and fixes the Time which they are to continue in each Degree. They are to be Janitors or Door-keepers one Year, Lectors

thing certain either of his Life or Adminiſtration. *Anaſtaſius* indeed tells us, that by him the Biſhop of *Oſtia* was firſt appointed to ordain the Biſhop of *Rome*, and to carry the *Pallium* or Pall; where *Baronius* obſerves, that the Pall is here mentioned for the Firſt time [m]. But *Anaſtaſius* is not a Writer we can depend upon. It is certain, however, that the Biſhops of *Oſtia* have long enjoyed this Privilege; for it is mentioned by St. *Auſtin* [n], and likewiſe in a Memorial preſented by the Clergy of *Rome* in 418. to the Emperor *Honorius*, on Occaſion of the Election of Pope *Zoſimus* [o]. The Letter which the Biſhops of *Egypt* are ſaid to have wrote to this Pope, and his Anſwer to them, are rejected even by *Baronius* [p], and very juſtly; for the Pope's Anſwer is dated Eighteen Days after his Death. He died on the 7th of *October* the ſame Year he had been choſen [q], and was buried in the Cœmetery of *Balbina*, which was thenceforth called after his Name [r]. His Body is now worſhiped in the Church of St. *Laurence* at *Florence*, though no Mention is made by any Writer of its having ever been tranſlated thither [s].

The Biſhop of Rome *ordained by the Biſhop of* Oſtia.

CONSTANTINE and his Three Sons,

JULIUS,

CONSTANTINE, CONSTANTIUS, and CONSTANS.

Thirty-fourth BISHOP *of* Rome.

UPON the Death of *Mark* the See was vacant for the Space of Four Months, that is, to the 6th of *February* 337. when *Julius* was choſen [t]. He is ſaid to have held a Council of an Hundred and Sixteen Biſhops in the *December* of the ſame Year [u]. But the Date of this Council puts *Baronius* to a Stand; for in the Date are marked the Conſuls, the Year of the Emperors, and the Indiction. Now, according to the Conſuls, it muſt have been held in 337. according to the Year of the Emperors in 340. and, according to the Indiction, in

Year of Chriſt 337.

Falſly ſaid to have held a griat Council at Rome.

[m] Bar. ad ann. 336. n. 64. [n] Aug. coll. die 3. c. 16. [o] Vide Du Pin diſſert. 1. n. 13. [p] Bar. ibid. n. 60, 61. [q] Soz. l. 2. c. 20. Hier. chron. Buch. p. 267, 273. [r] Front. cal. p. 141. [s] Bolland. Pont. p. 50. [t] Buch. p. 273. [u] Concil. tom. 2. p. 527.

Lectors or Readers Twenty, Exorciſts Ten, Acolytes Five, Subdeacons Five, Deacons Five, and Prieſts Six; ſo that none under Threeſcore could attain to the Epiſcopal Dignity; which is highly abſurd in itſelf, and contrary to the Practice of thoſe Times.

347. The Annaliſt ſpares neither his Words nor his Labour to ſolve, or rather to patch up, this Difficulty; but, being ſenſible, after a long, tedious, and puzzling Deſcant, that he labours in vain, he concludes, that the Text has been altered [w]. He might have ſaved himſelf a great deal of Trouble, by owning at once what has been plainly proved ſince by *Blondel* [x], *viz.* that no ſuch Council was ever held.

When *Julius* was raiſed to the Pontificate, the celebrated *Athanaſius*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, lived in Baniſhment at *Treves*; but the Year following he was allowed to return to his Church by the Three Emperors, *Conſtantine*, *Conſtantius*, and *Conſtans*, who had ſucceeded their Father in 337. The *Euſebians*, that is, the *Arian* Faction headed by *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Nicomedia*, at whoſe Inſtigation he had been baniſhed by *Conſtantine*, alarmed at his Return, wrote bitter Letters againſt him to the Three Princes, and likewiſe to the Biſhop of *Rome*. To the latter they diſpatched with their Letters *Macarius* a Presbyter, and the two Deacons, *Martyrius* and *Heſychius*. *Athanaſius* no ſooner heard of this Embaſſy than he, in his Turn, diſpatched ſome Presbyters to oppoſe the Attempts of his Enemies, and defend his Innocence againſt the Calumnies, which he well knew they were ſent to ſpread againſt him, not only at *Rome*, but all over the Weſt [y]. Upon their Arrival, *Macarius* privately withdrew from *Rome*, and the other Two were ſo confounded by the Deputies of *Athanaſius*, at a private Conference held before the Pope, that, to gain Time, they had no other Reſource but to appeal to a Council, which they begged the Pope to aſſemble, and to give timely notice thereof both to *Athanaſius* and the *Euſebians*. They bragged that, before the Council, they would make good the Charge they had brought againſt *Athanaſius*, and offered to take *Julius* himſelf for their Judge [z]. This Offer, we may be ſure, was readily accepted by the Biſhop of *Rome*, who immediately wrote to *Athanaſius* inviting him to the Council, and at the ſame time deſired the Deputies of the *Euſebians* to acquaint their Party, that, agreeably to their Requeſt, a Council ſhould be ſoon convened. *Athanaſius*, upon the Receipt of the Pope's Letter, ſet out, without Delay, for *Rome*, where he arrived in the Latter-end of the Year 339. After his Arrival the Biſhop of *Rome* diſpatched *Elpidius* and *Philoxenes*, two of his Presbyters, with Letters to the *Euſebians*, ſummoning them to the Council, which their Deputies had demand-

The Arians *write to* Julius *againſt* Athanaſius.

They deſire Julius *to aſſemble a Council.*

[w] Bar. ad ann. 337. n. 67. [x] Blond. decret. p. 451. [y] Athan. apol. 2. p. 741—745. [z] Id. ibid.

ed,

ed, and acquainting them with the Time and Place in which it was to be held [a]. The Place was *Rome*, and the Time the Month of *June* 341. according to the most probable Opinion. The other Bishops assembled at the Time appointed; but the *Eusebians*, instead of appearing at the Council of *Rome*, which had been convened at their Request, assembled one at *Antioch*, and there, without waiting for the Determination of *Julius*, whom they had chosen for their Judge, they deposed *Athanasius*, and appointed *Gregory* Bishop of *Alexandria* in his room; nay, they even detained the Deputies sent by the Pope till the Time appointed for the Meeting of the Council was expired, that they might afterwards plead, as they did, the Shortness of the Term prescribed for them to meet in [b]. In the Council of *Rome* the Cause of *Athanasius* was examined, and he, after the strictest Scrutiny, declared innocent with one Voice by the Fifty Bishops who composed it [c]; so that *Julius* and the rest continued to communicate with him as a Bishop [d], which was declaring him unlawfully deposed. Several other Bishops, who had been deposed by the *Arians*, came to lay their Complaints before the Council, and, among the rest, *Marcellus* Bishop of *Ancyra*, and *Paul* Bishop of *Constantinople*. The former had been condemned as a Heretic by an Council held at *Constantinople* in 336. and consisting intirely of *Arian* Bishops. As nobody appeared against him during the Fifteen Months he continued at *Rome*, and the Declaration of his Faith, which, at the Request of *Julius*, he gave under his own Hand, was judged quite orthodox by the Pope and the Council, he was readmitted to the Communion of the Catholic Church [e]. But whether they did not judge too favourably of his Belief, may be very much questioned: *Epiphanius* at least was no-ways satisfied with it [f]. And truly it would be no easy Task to clear him from the Heresy of *Sabellius* and *Samosatenus*, denying the Trinity of the Divine Persons [g]: but to examine so perplexed and intricate a Point, would be foreign to my Purpose. *Socrates* [h] and *Sozomen* [i] write, that *Julius*, by the Authority of his See, reinstated all the Bishops who had been displaced by the *Arians*; that he supported and defended their Innocence with Letters full of Vigour and Liberty; severely reprimanded those who had deposed them; summoned some

They decline appearing at the Council of Rome; *assemble one at* Antioch; *and there depose* Athanasius;

who is declared innocent in the Council of Rome.

Neither Athanasius *nor any other Bishop restored by* Julius.

[a] Id. ib. Socr. l. 2. c. 15. Soz. l. 3. c. 8. [b] Athan. ib. p. 744. & ad Solit. p. 816. [c] Id. ib. p. 748. [d] Idem ib. Hil. frag. p. 26. [e] Id. ib. p. 750. [f] Epiph. 72. c. 4. [g] Vide Petav. dog. t. 2. l. 1. c. 13. Hilar. de Trin. l. 7. p. 46. [h] Socr. l. 2. c. 15. [i] Soz. l. 3. c. 8.

of

of them to appear at *Rome*, in a limited Time, to juſtify their Conduct; and, laſtly, that he threatened to treat them as they deſerved, if they did not forbear raiſing Diſturbances in the Church. In virtue of theſe Letters, ſays *Socrates*, the Biſhops were reſtored to their Sees. But *Sozomen* names only *Athanaſius*, and *Paul* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. It is ſurpriſing that the Advocates for the See of *Rome* ſhould allege the Teſtimony of theſe two Writers, to prove that the Authority of the Biſhop of *Rome* was acknowleged by the Orientals; that his Juriſdiction was univerſal; when they themſelves muſt know (for I cannot ſuppoſe them ſo ignorant as not to know) that the Hiſtorians whom they quote were groſly miſtaken. For it is manifeſt from *Athanaſius*[k], that *Julius* wrote only two Letters to the *Euſebians*; one before the Council met, inviting them to it; and the other, while the Council was ſtill ſitting, which I ſhall ſpeak of hereafter; and in neither of theſe does *Julius* take upon him either to threaten or command. The above-mentioned Hiſtorians ſeem to have jumbled theſe two Letters together, and to have made a Third out of them, with ſome Improvements of their own. As to his reſtoring the depoſed Biſhops to their Sees, it is certain he did not, ſince *Athanaſius* continued in the Weſt till the Year 349. when he was reſtored by the Council of *Sardica*. *Paul* indeed was reinſtated ſooner, but not till the See of *Conſtantinople* became vacant by the Death of *Euſebius*, who had been tranſlated from *Nicomedia* to that City. I appeal to the *Roman* Catholics themſelves, and leave them to judge whether it is at all probable, that the Emperor *Conſtantius*, and the Oriental Biſhops, incenſed as they were againſt *Paul* and *Athanaſius*, whom they had condemned and depoſed in Two Synods, ſhould, out of Reſpect to the Pope, ſuffer them thus tamely to return to their Sees, and drive out thoſe whom they had placed in their room. This had been owning themſelves guilty, and reverſing the Sentence they had but lately pronounced, which, as will appear, they were no ways in an Humour to do.

The Euſebians *write to* Julius;

While the Council of *Rome* was yet ſitting, the Pope's two Deputies, *Elpidius* and *Philoxenes*, returning from the Eaſt, delivered to *Julius* a Letter from the *Euſebians*, which may paſs for a Maſterpiece of the Kind; for, without departing from, or intrenching upon, the Reſpect that was due to the Biſhop of the Imperial City, they, at the ſame time, commend, cenſure, menace, and rally him in a moſt cruel Manner. They begin with alleging ſeveral frivolous Excuſes for

[k] Athan. ap. 2. p. 739.

not

4

not appearing at the Council, ſuch as the *Perſian* War, which, by the way, did not prevent their aſſembling at *Antioch*; the Shortneſs of the Term preſcribed for their Meeting; the Pope's writing only to ſome of them, and not to all, as he ought to have done; and, finally, his writing to them in his own Name alone, which was tacitly taxing him with taking too much upon him. They then launch out ironically, it ſeems, into the higheſt Encomiums on the Church of *Rome*, ſtyling her the firſt of all Churches, the School of the Apoſtles, the Metropolis of true Piety. However, the firſt Preachers of the Goſpel, add they, came out of the Eaſt; and, after all, we ought to be looked upon as Inferiors to none, though perhaps we may not have ſuch numerous and flouriſhing Churches, as ſome have, ſince the want of Numbers may be abundantly ſupplied by the Piety of a few. As to Rank, we are all equal, the Greatneſs of the Cities, in which we preſide, adding nothing to the Dignity we all enjoy. In the next place, they expreſs great Concern at the little Regard ſhewn by ſome to the Deciſions of Councils, which ought to be revered by all, and deemed immutable. This was modeſtly cenſuring the Pope for not acquieſcing to the Decrees of the Councils of *Tyre* and *Conſtantinople* condemning *Athanaſius*. In the End they allege ſeveral Things both againſt *Athanaſius*, and *Marcellus* Biſhop of *Ancyra*; and conclude with telling *Julius*, that if he renounced all Correſpondence and Intercourſe with the Biſhops they had depoſed, and acknowleged thoſe they had placed in their room, they would continue to communicate with him; but if he refuſed to comply with their Deciſions and Decrees, they ſhould think themſelves obliged to act in a very different Manner[1]. *Julius* was ſo mortified with this Letter, that he ſuppreſſed it for ſome time, hoping the *Euſebians* would ſend Deputies, who, he preſumed, would expreſs their Sentiments by Word of Mouth, and in a different Style. But, none appearing, he was obliged to lay the Letter he had received before the Fathers of the Council, who, after expreſſing the greateſt Indignation againſt the *Euſebians*, adviſed the Pope to anſwer it; which he did accordingly, by that excellent Letter, which has been preſerved intire among the Works of *Athanaſius*. He begins with complaining, in very modeſt Terms, of the Animoſity they betrayed in their Letter, to which he thought he had given no Occaſion; unleſs they had taken it amiſs, that he had ſummoned

and threaten to ſeparate themſelves from his Communion.

Julius's *Anſwer to their Letter.*

[1] Id. ib. p. 740—749. & ad Solit. p. 816. Soz. l. 3. c. 8. Euſeb. l. 6. c. 43. Hil. frag. p. 25.

them

them to the Council; which he could not perſuade himſelf they did, ſince, at the Requeſt of their Deputies, he had appointed the Council to meet, and, at their Requeſt, invited them to it. As for the Regard due to the Decrees and Deciſions of Councils, he told them, that they had treſpaſſed the firſt againſt the Decrees of the Oecumenical Council of *Nice*, by admitting the *Arians* to their Communion, which he conceived to be more criminal in them, than it was in him, to receive *Athanaſius* and *Marcellus*. He reproaches them with another Tranſgreſſion of the Canons of the Church, namely, with that of paſſing from one Biſhoprick to another, which *Euſebius* had done. He then juſtifies his Conduct with regard to *Athanaſius* and *Marcellus*; exhorts the *Euſebians*, with great Zeal and Earneſtneſs, to find out ſome Remedy againſt the Evils and Diſorders that reigned in the Eaſt, which he deſcribes at length; and concludes with complaining of the Orientals for condemning and depoſing Biſhops, thoſe eſpecially of the Apoſtolic Sees, without the Concurrence or Knowlege of their Brethren in the Weſt [m].

Julius, finding his Letter made no Impreſſion on the *Euſebians*, applied with ſeveral other Biſhops to the Emperor *Conſtans*, who, at their Requeſt propoſed to his Brother *Conſtantius* the aſſembling of an Oecumenical Council, in order to put an End to thoſe unhappy Diviſions. To this Propoſal *Conſtantius* agreed; and accordingly, by the Command of the two Princes, a numerous Council met in 347. at *Sardica*, the Metropolis of *Dacia* in *Illyricum* [n]. *Julius*, apprehending it dangerous to abandon his Flock at that Juncture, did not aſſiſt in Perſon, but by his Deputies *Archidamus* and *Philoxenes*, who ſigned in his Name [o]. The Orientals came, but withdrew ſoon after, upon the Council's refuſing to exclude *Athanaſius*, and ſome others, whom they had condemned [p]. But by the orthodox Biſhops, who remained, the Acts of the Council of *Rome* were confirmed, *Athanaſius* and Three other Biſhops declared innocent; and thoſe, who had been placed in their room, not only depoſed, but anathematized, and intirely cut off from the Communion of the Catholic Church [q]. The Council, before they broke up, wrote ſeveral Letters; and, among the reſt, one to the Emperors; one to the Biſhop of *Rome*; and a cir-

The Council of Sardica.

[m] Athan. ib. p. 740—753. [n] Athan. ib. p. 761. Socr. l. 1. c. 20. Hil. frag. 2. p. 7. Soz. l. 3. c. 12, &c. [o] Athan. ib. p. 767. [p] Athan. ad Solit. p. 819. Hil. frag. 2. p. 22. [q] Athan. ib. p. 766. & ad Sol. p. 820. Theod. l. 2. c. 6. Hil. frag. 1. p. 18.

cular Letter to all the Biſhops of the Catholic Church, acquainting them with what had paſſed, and exhorting them to join the Council, and declare to the World, that they accepted their Decrees by ſubſcribing to them[r]. The circular Letter was ſubſcribed firſt by the great *Oſius* Biſhop of *Cordoua*, and in the ſecond Place by the Pope's Legate[s]. In their Letter to *Julius* they beg him to notify their Decrees to the Biſhops of *Sardinia*, *Sicily*, and *Italy*, leſt any of them ſhould receive Letters of Peace and Communion from the Biſhops they had condemned[t]. In this Letter the Council ſays, or rather is made to ſay, That *it is very meet or reaſonable, that all Biſhops ſhould acquaint their Head, that is, the See of St.* Peter, *with what paſſes in their reſpective Provinces*[u]. I agree with *Blondel*[w], that this Paſſage is foiſted in; but cannot acquieſce to the only Reaſon he alleges to ſupport his Opinion, *viz.* the Barbarity of the *Latin* Expreſſion *(valde congruentiſſimum eſt)*; for ſuch a Slip might eaſily eſcape Men wholly bent on defending the Truth, and ſpeaking it; and beſides, we are not certain that this Letter was originally written in *Latin*. The want of Connection between that Sentence, and what is ſaid both before and after it, is, I think, a more convincing Proof of Forgery.

Canons of the Council of Sardica *relating to the Biſhop of* Rome.

By the Council of *Sardica* ſeveral Canons were made, but I ſhall only take notice of thoſe that regard the Biſhop of *Rome*. By the Third Canon in the *Greek*, or the Fourth in the *Latin* Tranſlation by *Iſidorus*, it is ordered, that if any Biſhop ſhall think himſelf unjuſtly condemned, his Judges ſhall acquaint the Biſhop of *Rome* therewith, who may either confirm the firſt Judgment, or order his Cauſe to be re-examined by ſuch of the neighbouring Biſhops as he ſhall think fit to name[x]. *Oſius*, who was greatly addicted to the See of *Rome*, begged the Council to grant this Honour to the Memory of St. *Peter*. The Fourth Canon, according to the *Greek*, adds, That the See of the depoſed Biſhop ſhall remain vacant till his Cauſe ſhall be judged by the Biſhop of *Rome*. By the Fifth Canon, which, by ſome Miſtake, is the Seventh in *Dionyſius Exiguus*, it is ordered, that if a Biſhop, condemned in his own Province, ſhall chuſe to be judged by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and deſires him to appoint ſome of his Presbyters to judge him in his Name, together with the Biſhops, the Biſhop of *Rome* may grant him his Requeſt. Thus was the pernicious Practice of appealing to the Pope firſt introduced and authorized. It muſt be

The Practice of appealing to the Pope firſt introduced.

[r] Athan. ib. [s] Id. ib. p. 767. [t] Hil. frag. 1. p. 15, 16. [u] Id. ibid.
[w] Blond. prim. p. 106. [x] Concil. t. 2. p. 652.

Several Circumſtances concur in his Favour.

obſerved, that the Oriental Biſhops had all left the Council: thoſe who remained were all zealous Oppoſers of *Arianiſm*. At the Head of their Party was the Biſhop of *Rome*. In the Heat of their Zeal they thought they could not confer too much Power upon him; and ſo made a Conceſſion intirely repugnant to the Diſcipline of the primitive Church, and which he could never have obtained, had not thoſe Diſpoſitions worked ſtrongly in his Favour. This will not be ſurpriſing to thoſe, who have attended to Hiſtory, and ſeen how much the Ambition of Princes, and Heads of Factions, is often advanced beyond its due Bounds by the indiſcreet Fervour of Party-Zeal. To the Council of *Sardica*, acting under this Influence, the See of *Rome* is indebted for the ſo much boaſted Privilege of receiving Appeals; and *Julius* was very thankful for it. But his Succeſſors, looking upon ſuch an Obligation as a Diminution of their pretended Sovereignty, have had the Aſſurance to claim it as their original Right: but that ſuch a Right was unknown to their great Friend *Oſius*, to the Fathers of the Council, nay, and to the Pope himſelf, and his Legates, is manifeſt, ſince what they now claim as their original and inherent Right, was, by *Oſius*, begged of the Council as a Favour, and, as ſuch, granted by the Council, and accepted by the Pope and his Legates. This Power of receiving Appeals, only with reſpect to the judging and depoſing of Biſhops, has been extended by the Popes to all Cauſes; and great Encouragement has been given to ſuch as recurred to their Tribunal on the ſlighteſt Occaſions. *Concerning Appeals in the ſmalleſt Cauſes, we would have you to know, that the ſame Regard is to be had to them, for how ſlight a Matter ſoever they be made, as if they were for a greater,* ſays Pope *Alexander* III. in his Letter to the Biſhop of *Worceſter* [y]. The ſcandalous and intolerable Abuſe of this Power in the Popes has obliged ſeveral Princes, even when Superſtition moſt prevailed, to reſtrain their Subjects by ſevere Laws from recurring to *Rome*. Nay, other Councils of far greater Authority than that of *Sardica*, finding no other Means to put a Stop to the daily Incroachments of the See of *Rome*, have thought it neceſſary to revoke the Privilege, which that Council had too raſhly granted, as we ſhall ſee in the Sequel of the preſent Hiſtory.

The Popes claim as their original Right, what was granted them as a Favour.

Decrees of the Council of Antioch *revoked by the Council of* Sardica.

It had been decreed but Six Years before, by the Council of *Antioch*, that if the Biſhops of the ſame Province diſagreed in judging one of

[y] In decret. Greg. l. 2. tit. 28. c. 11.

their Brethren, the Metropolitan might call in thoſe of the neighbouring Province to judge with them; but if they agreed, and were unanimous either in condemning or abſolving, their Judgment ſhould be irreverſible. Both theſe Decrees were revoked by the preſent Council, though intirely agreeable to the antient Practice and Diſcipline of the Church. But yet this Council, however favourable to the Pope, did not grant him the Power of ſummoning Biſhops to *Rome*, in order to be judged there by him. He was only impowered to examine the Judgment given in the Province; and, in caſe he found it to be wrong, to order another in the ſame Province, to invite to this new Synod the Biſhops of the next Province, and to ſend his Legates to it as he thought fit.

The Pope has no Power to ſummon Biſhops to Rome.

At this Council the Pope's Legates aſſiſted; but *Oſius* preſided, as we are told in expreſs Terms by *Theodoret* [z], by *Sozomen* [a], and by the Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon* [b]. Beſides, his Name is the firſt in the Subſcriptions, as they have been tranſmitted to us by *Athanaſius*, who aſſures us, that *Oſius* was the Chief, and preſided in all the Councils at which he aſſiſted. He ſigned the firſt, and in his own Name; after him ſigned the Legates, not in their own, but in the Pope's Name; *Julius Romæ per Archidamum & Philoxenum Preſbyteros*; which is a ſufficient Confutation of *De Marca*, and the other Popiſh Writers, pretending, without the leaſt Foundation, that *Oſius* preſided in the Name of *Julius*.

Oſius *did not preſide at the Council of* Sardica *as the Pope's Legate.*

It is to be obſerved. that the Canons of this Council were never received in the Eaſt, nor even in the Weſt by the Biſhops of *Africa*; and that they were not inſerted by the Council of *Chalcedon* into the Code of Canons approved by them, as Rules to be univerſally obſerved: ſo that, after all, the ſo much boaſted Council of *Sardica* is a Council of no great Authority. Of this the Popes themſelves were well appriſed; and therefore, recurring to Fraud, attempted, as we ſhall ſee hereafter, to impoſe upon the World the Canons of *Sardica* as the Canons of *Nice*.

The Council of Sardica *a Council of no great Authority.*

Athanaſius, though declared innocent by the Council, did not think it adviſeable to return to his See, being informed, that the *Euſebians* had prevailed upon the Emperor *Conſtantius* to iſſue an Order, impowering and commanding the Magiſtrates of *Alexandria* to put him to Death, without further Tryal, in what Place ſoever he ſhould

Athanaſius *retires to* Naiſſus.

[z] Theodoret. l. 2. c. 15. [a] Soz. l. 3. c. 11. [b] Concil. l. 4. p. 825.

be found within the Precincts of that Jurisdiction [c]. He therefore retired to *Naissus* in *Upper Dacia*, and there continued from the Year 347. to 349. when *Constantius* chose rather to recall him, and the other exiled Bishops, than engage in a Civil War, with which he was threatened by his Brother, if he did not [d]. Before his Departure for the East he went to *Rome*, to take his Leave of that Church, and his great Protector *Julius*, who, on that Occasion, wrote an excellent Letter of Congratulation to the Presbyters, Deacons, and People of *Alexandria*. Of this Letter we have Two Copies, the one in *Socrates* [e], and the other in *Athanasius* [f]. The former contains great Commendations of that Prelate, which, out of Modesty, were, as I conjecture, omitted by him.

Is recalled by Constantius.

Julius had, soon after, the Satisfaction of receiving a solemn Retractation made by *Ursacius* Bishop of *Singidunum*, and *Valens* Bishop of *Mursus*, Two of *Athanasius*'s most inveterate Enemies, publicly owning, that whatever they had said or wrote against him was utterly false, groundless, and invented out of pure Malice: at the same time they embraced his Communion, and anathematized the Heresy of *Arius*, and all who held or defended his Tenets. This Act *Valens* wrote with his own Hand, and *Ursacius* signed it; whereupon they were both admitted by *Julius* to the Communion of the Church [g] (A). This Retractation, though

Ursacius *and* Valens *retract all they had said against* Athanasius.

[c] Ath. apol. 2. p. 271. & ad Sol. p. 820. [d] Idem ad Sol. p. 822. Ruf. l. 1. c. 19. Theod. l. 2. c. 6. [e] Socr. l. 2. c. 23. [f] Athan. apol. 2. p. 770. [g] Ath. ad Solit. p. 826. & Apol. 2. p. 776. Hil. frag. 1. p. 24—26.

(A) *Ursacius* and *Valens* first abjured, or rather pretended to abjure, their Errors at *Milan*, before the Council, that at this Time was sitting there. From *Milan* they repaired to *Rome*, and there abjured anew their Errors, in the Presence of *Julius*, and the whole *Roman* Church. Here *Baronius* observes, *that as this was a Matter of too great Moment to be finally decided by the Council of* Milan, *though the* Roman *Presbyters were present, they sent them to* Julius, *that they might abjure their Errors in his Presence, agreeably to the antient Custom of the Catholic Church*; viz. *that eminent Heretics should abjure their Heresies only at* Rome (1). But, in the first Place, they were not sent by the Council; but went to *Rome* of their own Accord, as *Osius* assures us, in express Terms, *Illi ultro Romam venerunt* (2). In the second Place, the Matter was finally determined by the Council of *Milan*; for the Council received their Recantation, and restored them to the Communion of the Church. And what else was to be done? what else could *Julius* do? But if the Matter was finally determined by the Council, what could induce them, says *Baronius*, to travel to *Rome*, and abjure anew their Heresy there? The Answer is obvious: They had imposed upon the Council by a pretended Abjuration, and went to *Rome* to impose, in like manner, on *Julius*, and obtain by that means his Communion; which they did accordingly, notwithstanding his *Infallibility*. Besides, as both *Athanasius* and his

(1) Bar. ad ann. 350. n. 23. (2) Apud Ath. ad Solitar.

Enemies

though not at all ſincere, but merely owing to Policy, greatly contributed to the Juſtification of *Athanaſius*. I find nothing elſe in the Antients, concerning *Julius*, worthy of Notice. He died on the 12th of *April* 352. having governed the Church of *Rome* Fifteen Years, Two Months, and Six Days [f]. He is ſaid to have been buried in the Cœmetery of *Calliſtus*, on the *Aurelian* Way, where he had built a Church [g], and to have been removed from thence in 817. by Pope *Paſchal* I. to the Church of St. *Praxedes*; and again from that, by *Innocent* II. in 1140. to *St. Mary's* beyond the *Tyber* [h]. *Bede*, whom the Authors of the modern Pontificals have followed, tells us, in his Martyrology [i], that *Julius* was ſent into Baniſhment, where he ſuffered much for the Space of Ten Months, till the Death of *Conſtantius*, a zealous Promoter of *Arianiſm*. But that Hiſtorian was certainly miſtaken, ſince *Conſtantius* was never Maſter of *Rome* in *Julius's* Time, and his Brother *Conſtans* was a great Friend to *Julius*, and all the orthodox Biſhops. Of the many Writings aſcribed to *Julius*, none, except his Two Letters, are authentic, the one to the *Euſebians*, and the other to the Church of *Alexandria*, of which we have ſpoken above. *Leontius* of *Byzantium* mentions Seven Epiſtles, which, in the latter End of the Sixth Century, were aſcribed to *Julius* [k]; but, at the ſame time, he aſſures us, that they were not wrote by him, but by *Apollinaris* the Hereſiarch; and the Monks of *Palæſtine*, in the Account they gave of the *Eutychians*, in the Time of the Emperor *Anaſtaſius*, aſſure us, that they ſeduced great Numbers of People, by aſcribing the Works of *Apollinaris* to the Fathers, namely to *Athanaſius*, to *Gregory Nazianzene*, and to *Julius* [l]. *Gennadius* aſcribes to *Julius* a Letter to *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Corinth*, greatly favouring of the Hereſy of *Eutyches* and *Timo-*

Julius *dies.*

Julius *was not baniſhed by* Conſtantius.

Spurious Pieces aſcribed to him.

[f] Buch. cycl. 267, 273. [g] Idem ib. [h] Bolland. 12 Apr. p. 86. n. 14. [i] Bed. martyr. p. 83. [k] Leont. ſect. 8. p. 526. [l] Evagr. l. 3. c. 31.

Enemies had referred their Cauſe to the Arbitration of *Julius*, he was the fitteſt Perſon to receive the Retractation of the falſe Evidence, which they had formerly given. As to the Cuſtom, mentioned by *Baronius*, that *eminent Heretics ſhould abjure their Hereſies only at* Rome, no Man can be ſo little verſed in eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory as not to know, that no ſuch Cuſtom ever obtained in the Catholic Church. Not to recur to more antient Times, the *Arian* Biſhops, that is, Biſhops guilty of the ſame Hereſy as *Urſacius* and *Valens*, abjured their Errors before the Council that was held at *Jeruſalem* in 335. There they renounced their Hereſy; there they were all reſtored to the Communion of the Church, without going, or offering to go, to *Rome*. And many of thoſe Biſhops were ſurely more eminent Heretics than either *Urſacius* or *Valens*.

theus;

theus [m]; but *Leontius* of *Byzantium* evidently proves that Letter to have been wrote by *Apollinaris*; and as his it is quoted by his Two Diſciples *Valentine* and *Timotheus* [n]. The Orientals have a Liturgy, which they ſuppoſe to have been compoſed by *Julius*: this Suppoſition, however groundleſs, ſhews him to have been in great Repute in thoſe Parts [o].

CONSTANTIUS, JULIAN, **LIBERIUS,** JOVIAN, VALERIAN.

Thirty-fifth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 352.

LIBERIUS was choſen on the 22d of *May* 352. in the room of *Julius* [p]. He had trampled under-foot (to uſe his own Terms) all worldly things, to obſerve the Goſpel, and obey the Dictates of his Faith. He had been employed, before his Election, in ſeveral eccleſiaſtical Miniſtries, and diſcharged them with Reputation, though he was not conſcious to himſelf of having ever done the leaſt thing for the ſake of Praiſe and Glory. He was at laſt raiſed to the epiſcopal Dignity, but much againſt his Will, as he calls God and the Church to witneſs. He proteſts, that it was his ardent and only Wiſh, that he might keep himſelf pure and undefiled in the Adminiſtration of his new Dignity, that he might inviolably maintain and defend the Faith, which he had received from his illuſtrious Predeceſſors, among whom were many Martyrs [q]. Were we to judge of his Conduct from his Words, we ſhould equal him to the beſt of his Predeceſſors; but there appears, throughout his whole Adminiſtration, ſuch an odd Mixture of oppoſite Qualities, that it is no eaſy Matter to form a true Idea of his Character: at one time we ſhall find him bold, intrepid, and inflexible; at another timorous, faint-hearted, and compliant; inſomuch that one can hardly conceive him to be the ſame Man. The latter Qualities he betrayed in the very Beginning of his Pontificate, by ſeparating himſelf from the Communion of *Athanaſius*. *Conſtans*, the great Support of the orthodox Party, being murdered, and *Conſtantius* upon the Point of becoming Maſter of *Rome*, by a complete Victory he had gained over the Two Brothers, *Magnentius* and *Decentius*, the *Euſebians* thought this a proper

Liberius *his own Panegyriſt.*

No eaſy Matter to form a true Idea of his Character

[m] Gen. c. 2. [n] Leont. ib. [o] Eona lit. l. 1. c. 9. p. 64. [p] Buch. cycl. p. 273. [q] Hil. frag. 2. p. 41.

Juncture

Juncture to try whether the Fear of that Prince had not rendered *Julius* ſomewhat more tractable. For *Conſtantius* was more incenſed than ever againſt *Athanaſius*, being aſſured by the *Euſebians*, to whom he gave an intire Credit, that he had influenced his Brother to threaten him with a Civil War [q]. They wrote therefore to *Julius* a ſecond Letter, filled with new Complaints and Calumnies againſt *Athanaſius*; but *Julius* dying in the mean time, their Letter, together with another to the ſame Purpoſe from the *Arians* of *Alexandria*, was delivered to *Liberius*, who cauſed them both to be publicly read in a full Aſſembly of the People, and in the Council, which was then ſitting at *Rome* [r]. His Anſwer to theſe Letters has not reached our Times; but a Copy of the Letter, which he wrote on that Occaſion to *Athanaſius*, has, to his eternal Diſgrace, been tranſmitted to us, among the Fragments of *Hilarius* Biſhop of *Poitiers*. In that Letter he ſummons him to appear forthwith at *Rome*, to clear himſelf there of the heavy Accuſations brought againſt him; and threatens to cut him off from the Communion of that Church, if he refuſed to comply with the Summons [s]. With this Letter he diſpatched Three of his Presbyters, *Lucius*, *Paulus*, and *Ælianus*, ſtrictly injoining them, by all means, to prevail upon *Athanaſius* to repair, without Delay, to *Rome* [t]. This Conduct, ſo very different from that of his Predeceſſor, was, no doubt, owing to the Dread he was in of the Emperor *Conſtantius*, by this Time probably Maſter of *Rome*, and all *Italy*; for what elſe could tempt or induce him to act ſo prepoſterouſly? Be that as it will, *Athanaſius* was greatly ſurpriſed and concerned to find himſelf ſo unworthily treated and threatened by the Biſhop of *Rome*; but did not think himſelf, on that Account, obliged to abandon his Flock. He remained therefore in *Alexandria*; but begged his Collegues in *Egypt* to write in his Favour to the Pope; which they did accordingly. But *Liberius* wanted to ingratiate himſelf with the *Arians*, and, by their means, with the Emperor; and therefore, without any Regard to the Teſtimony of the orthodox Biſhops, or the known Innocence of the oppreſſed *Athanaſius*, he wrote to the *Euſebians*, acquainting them, that he communicated with them; but, as to *Athanaſius*, he had cut him off from his Communion, and from that of his Church [u]. *Baronius* [w],

The Euſebians *write a ſecond Letter to* Julius, *againſt* Athanaſius:

which is anſwered by Liberius:

who ſummons Athanaſius *to* Rome.

Liberius *communicates with the* Arians, *and excommunicates* Athanaſius.

[q] Ath. ad Solit. p. 828. & Apol. 2. p. 674. Theod. l. 2. c. 10. [r] Hil. frag. 1. p. 36, 40. [s] Idem ib. [t] Idem ib. [u] Idem ib. [w] Bar. ad ann. 352. n. 12—20.

and

His Letter to them not ſuppoſititious.

and after him the *Benedictines*, in their laſt Edition of the Works of *Hilarius* and *Athanaſius* [x], maintain this Letter of *Liberius* to have been forged by the *Arians*, and inſerted into the Works of *Hilarius*. But they allege no convincing Reaſon why the other Pieces, among which it has been conveyed to us, ſhould be admitted as genuine, and this alone rejected as ſuppoſititious. *Athanaſius*, indeed, never reproached the Biſhop of *Rome* with his ſcandalous Conduct, as they obſerve; but may not that be aſcribed to his Moderation? The more, as he was ſenſible, that *Liberius* acted thus not out of Ill-will, but Fear. As to the Want of Connection between that Letter and the Pieces preceding and following it, I ſhould not have expected ſuch an Objection from any who had ever peruſed the Fragments of that Writer, which every one knows to have been patched together without any Regard to Time or Order (B).

The Council of Arles.

In the mean time *Conſtantius*, now in quiet Poſſeſſion of the whole Empire by the Death of *Magnentius*, who, after his Defeat, had laid violent Hands on himſelf, ſummoned a Council to meet at *Arles*. At this Council *Liberius* did not aſſiſt in Perſon, but by his Legates, *Vincentius* Biſhop of *Capua*, and *Marcellus* Biſhop of *Campania*, who, together with ſome others, had been ſent by *Liberius* ſome time before to meet the Emperor at *Arles*, and beg him in the Pope's Name to aſſemble a Council at *Aquileia* [y]. As the Biſhop of *Capua* was a Man of great Parts, and long Experience, *Liberius* repoſed

[x] Hil. p. 1327. & Athan. vit. p. 51. p. 159. Hil. frag. 2. p. 41, 47.

[y] Ath. ad Solit. p. 829. Sulp. Sever. l. 2.

(B) Thus the very Letter of *Liberius* is put in the Place where the Letter of the Council of *Sardica* to the Emperor *Conſtantius* ought to have been, as is manifeſt from what is ſaid immediately before it. A few Lines after, inſtead of the Letter from the Council of *Egypt* to *Liberius*, which *Hilarius* promiſes, we find one from *Liberius* to the Biſhops of *Italy*, written after the Death of *Conſtantius* upon a quite different Subject. What comes immediately after the Letter of *Liberius* to the *Euſebians*, ought, in all Likelihood, to have been placed after the above-mentioned Letter of the Council of *Sardica* to *Conſtantius*: for to me it appears no leſs improbable than it does or can do to *Baronius* (1), that *Hilarius*, a moſt zealous Stickler for the orthodox Faith, ſhould approve of the Pope's ſcandalous Letter, tending utterly to ſubvert it, and expreſs his Approbation in theſe Terms; *What is there in this Letter that is not holy? What is there that does not proceed from the Fear of God?* However, I cannot conclude, and much leſs demonſtratively, with the Annaliſt, that the Letter has been forged by the *Arians*. All I think can be inferred from thence is, that the Letters, like moſt other Pieces there, have been miſplaced; and that the above-mentioned Words of *Hilarius* ought to be put after the Letter of the Council to *Conſtantius*, and not after that of *Liberius* to the *Arians*.

(1) Bar. ad ann. 352. n. 13.

an

an intire Confidence in him, not doubting but he would maintain the Dignity of his Legation, and ſupport the Innocency of *Athanaſius* with that Firmneſs which he had ſhewn on ſeveral other Occaſions (B).

As the Council conſiſted chiefly of *Arians*, their great Point in view was, to extort from the *Italian* Biſhops a ſolemn Condemnation of *Athanaſius*. This therefore was in the firſt place propoſed in the Council; and, becauſe the orthodox Biſhops would not conſent to it, an Edict was iſſued by the Emperor ſentencing all thoſe to Exile who ſhould refuſe to ſign the Condemnation of *Athanaſius* [a]. The boaſted Firmneſs and Conſtancy of *Vincentius* were not Proof againſt ſuch a Trial. He did all that lay in his Power to divert the Emperor from the Execution of a Decree utterly inconſiſtent with the Liberty of a Council; but finding him deaf to all Remonſtrances, he began to capitulate, offering to ſign the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*, on condition the *Euſebians* ſigned that of *Arius*, and publicly abjured his Doctrine. This he thought would be ſome Alleviation of his Guilt, and therefore the Propoſal which he had made by Word of Mouth he gave in Writing to the Heads of the *Arian* Faction, ſigned by himſelf and his Fellow-legates. But the *Arians*, too well acquainted with their Weakneſs to grant them any Terms, peremptorily inſiſted upon their condemning *Athanaſius*, and referring the Cauſe and Doctrine of *Arius* to a more proper Juncture. *Vincentius* and his Collegues, finding the Enemies of *Athanaſius* thus inflexible, and, on the other hand, determined at all Events to keep their Biſhopricks, and avoid the Hardſhips of a painful Exile, complied at laſt, and *yielded to the troubleſome Times*, to uſe their ſoftening Expreſſion [b]. They were the more inexcuſable, as they had before their Eyes the Example of a great Prelate, whoſe Conſtancy was proof againſt all the Threats and Menaces of a provoked Prince. This was the celebrated *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Treves*, who, after peruſing the Formulary, drawn up by the *Euſebians*, to be ſigned by him and the other Biſhops, rejected it with the utmoſt Indignation, declaring that nothing they could do ſhould ever induce him to betray the Truth, and his own Conſcience,

The Emperor's Edict.

The Pope's Legates ſign the Condemnation of Athanaſius.

[a] Sulp. Sever. l. 2. p. 159. [b] Hil. frag. 2. p. 42. Ath. ap. 1. p. 691. Theod. l. 2. c. 17.

(B) For *Liberius*, aſhamed of what he had done againſt *Athanaſius*, not only readmitted him ſoon after to his own Communion, but with great Zeal undertook his Defence.

by ſetting his Hand to ſuch a ſcandalous Piece. The *Euſebians* left no Art unattempted to gain him, as they had done the Pope's Legates; but finding he was a Man of a quite different Diſpoſition, and deſpairing of being ever able to prevail upon him either by Hopes or Fear, they at laſt had recourſe to the Emperor, who, putting his Decree in Execution, ſent him into Exile; and, in order to tire out his Patience, ordered him to be conſtantly conveyed from one inhoſpitable Place to another. But in every Place *Paulinus* was the ſame, the Conſcience of his ſuffering for the ſake of Juſtice enabling him to bear, not only with Patience, but Chearfulneſs, the inexpreſſible Hardſhips he underwent [c]. He died in *Phrygia* in the Fifth Year of his Exile [d], that is, in 358. But his Body is ſuppoſed to have been diſcovered in a Church of his Name at *Treves*, in the Year 1071 [e]. How and when it was conveyed thither, let thoſe inquire who adore it.

The glorious Behaviour of Paulinus.

To return to *Liberius*, he was ſo ſenſibly affected with the Fall of *Vincentius* and his Collegues, that he wiſhed for an Opportunity of loſing his Life in ſo good a Cauſe, and waſhing out with his Blood the Stain which the ſcandalous Conduct of his Legates had brought upon his Character [f]. Thus he expreſſes himſelf in the Letter, which he wrote on that Occaſion to the great Friend of his See *Oſius* [g]. However, in the Height of his Affliction, he found great Relief in the Courage and Steadineſs of *Cæcilianus* Biſhop of *Spoleto*, of *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Vercelli*, and of *Lucifer* Biſhop of *Cagliari* in *Sardinia*. The latter adviſed the Pope to demand of the Emperor another Council, and generouſly took upon himſelf to go to *Arles*, where *Conſtantius* then was, and make that Demand. *Liberius* readily accepted his Offer, and named *Pancratius* and *Hilarius* for his Collegues, the one a Presbyter, the other a Deacon, of the Church of *Rome*. By theſe he wrote an excellent Letter to the Emperor, wherein, with the Liberty that became a Catholic Biſhop, but at the ſame time with all the Reſpect that is due from a Subject to his Sovereign, he juſtifies his Conduct in the Defence of *Athanaſius*, lays open the Arts and Views of the adverſe Party, and begs that a new Council might be aſſembled, there being no other Means to put a Stop to ſo many Evils, and reſtore Peace and Tranquillity to the Catholic Church [h]. At the ſame time *Liberius* wrote to *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Vercelli*, and *Fortunatianus*

Liberius *writes to the Emperor for another Council*;

[c] Hil. frag. 1. p. 6. & in Conſ. l. 2. p. 119. Sulp. Sever. p. 157. Ath. in Ar. or. 1. p. 291. ad Solit. p. 831. de fug. 703. [d] Sulp. Sever. p. 169. Hier. chron.
[e] Bar. in martyr. 31. Aug. [f] Hil. frag. 47. [g] Id. ib. [h] Id. ib. p. 39, 43.

Biſhop

Biſhop of *Aquileia*, intreating them to aſſiſt his Legates with their Advice, and even with their Preſence, ſhould it be thought neceſſary. The Three Legates, on their Arrival at *Vercelli*, in their Way to *Arles*, were not only kindly received, but joined by *Euſebius*, who repaired with them to the Emperor. As the *Arians* were no-ways averſe to the Propoſal, nay, had even ſolicited the Emperor to convene a new Council, the Requeſt of the Legates met with no Difficulty; ſo that a Council was appointed to meet at *Milan*, where it met accordingly in the Beginning of the Year 355 [i]. We are told, that it conſiſted of Three hundred Weſtern Biſhops, and that from the Eaſt there came but very few [k]. But *Conſtantius* and his Army may be ſaid to have ſupplied their room. For the Council no ſooner met, than the Emperor abſolutely inſiſted upon their ſigning the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*, and an Edict, containing the chief Tenets of *Arius*, which had been publiſhed in his Name. But in this Attempt he met with a vigorous Oppoſition from *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Milan*, *Euſebius* of *Vercelli*, *Lucifer* of *Cagliari*, and the Two other Legates, *Pancratius* and *Hilarius*; which provoked him to ſuch a Degree, that he was upon the Point of commanding them to be executed upon the Spot as Rebels. But, upon ſecond Thoughts, he contented himſelf with ſending them into Exile, *Dionyſius* into *Cappadocia*, or *Armenia*, where he died a few Years after, *Euſebius* to *Scythopolis* in *Palæſtine*, and *Lucifer* to *Germanicia* in *Syria*. To what Place *Pancratius* and *Hilarius* were confined, we know not; but the latter was moſt cruelly whipt before he was baniſhed [l]. As for the other Biſhops, I ſhall only ſay, with *Ruffinus* [m], that, out of Three hundred, *Dionyſius*, *Lucifer*, and *Euſebius*, alone ſhewed a Firmneſs and Intrepidity becoming Men of their Rank and Dignity. Among the reſt *Fortunatianus* Biſhop of *Aquileia* ſigned the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*; which greatly added to the Grief and Concern of *Liberius*, who, till that Time, had entertained the higheſt Opinion of him.

which it granted, and aſſembles at Milan.

Some Biſhops baniſhed.

And now *Conſtantius* had the Satisfaction of ſeeing *Athanaſius* condemned by the far greater Part of the Weſtern Biſhops. But the Biſhop of *Rome* ſtill declared openly in his Favour, and did all that lay in his Power to gain others to his Party. To deprive him therefore of ſo powerful a Protector, the Emperor reſolved to ſpare no Coſt nor Labour. With this View he diſpatched to *Rome* the Eunuch *Euſebius*, Conſtantius *endeavours in vain to gain* Liberius;

[i] Sulp. Sever. l. 2. p. 159. Hil. frag. 2. p. 43. Athan. ad Solit. p. 846. [k] Soz. p. 546, 547. Socr. l. 2. c. 36. [l] Athan. ad Sol. p. 838. [m] Ruff. l. 1. c. 20.

his great Chamberlain, with rich Preſents in one Hand, and a threatening Letter in the other; but with an invincible Firmneſs *Liberius* withſtood both; ſo that the Eunuch, who was himſelf a ſworn Enemy to *Athanaſius*, returned to Court baffled and diſappointed; and there, by the Account he gave of his unſucceſsful Embaſſy, added new Fuel to the Fire, which burnt already with great Violence. The Emperor, who pretended to govern the Church no leſs deſpotically than he did the State, tranſported with Rage at the ſtout Oppoſition he met with from the Biſhop of *Rome*, immediately diſpatched an Order to *Leoncius*, Prefect of that City, injoining him to apprehend *Liberius*, and ſend him under a ſtrong Guard to Court. Purſuant to this Order, *Liberius* was ſeized in the Night-time, leſt the People, by whom he was greatly beloved, ſhould attempt his Reſcue, and conveyed to *Milan*, where the Court then reſided [n]. Soon after his Arrival he was brought before the Emperor, when, undaunted and unawed by the Preſence of ſo great a Prince, he ſpoke with all the Liberty of an Apoſtle, and with all the Eloquence of a great Orator [o]. At this Interview were preſent *Euſebius* the Eunuch, and *Epictetus* Biſhop of *Centumcellæ*, now *Civita-Vecchia*, who, for his ready Compliance with the Emperor's Will, had been raiſed by him to great Preferments [p]. The latter told *Liberius*, when he had ended the excellent Speech he made before the Emperor, that he had indeed expreſſed great Zeal for the Purity of the Faith, and the Liberty of Councils; but the Whole was mere Mummery; and that he only wanted to be looked upon by his Party as a Perſon of ſome Significancy, and to brag among the Senators, on his Return to *Rome*, that he had had the Honour to diſpute with the Emperor [q]. The Eunuch too thought he muſt ſpeak, but it was only to betray his Ignorance; for he reproached *Liberius* with defending *Athanaſius*, who had been condemned, he ſaid, as an Heretic, by the Council of *Nice* [r]. As for *Conſtantius*, the only Reply he made to the Reaſons alleged by *Liberius* in favour of *Athanaſius*, and the Faith of *Nice*, was, that the wicked and impious *Athanaſius*, as he ſtyled him, had been condemned by the whole World; that, by his arrogant Conduct, he had provoked all Mankind, and himſelf in particular, by conſtantly ſtirring up his Brother againſt him; that therefore he looked upon the Defeat of *Magnentius* and *Sylvanus*,

who is ſent Priſoner to Milan.

His Interview with the Emperor.

[n] Athan. ad Solit. p. 835,834. Ammian. l. 15. p. 47. Theod. l. 2. c. 13. & l. 15. p. 38, 41, 47. [o] Athan. & Theod. ib. [p] Athan. in Ar. or. 1. p. 290. Marcell. & Fauſtin. lib. prec. ad Theod. p. 30. [q] Theod. l. 2. c. 13. [r] Id. ib.

who had attempted to bereave him of his Crown, as leſs important to him than the depoſing and condemning of a Man, by whom he had been ſo highly injured [s]. In Anſwer to this, *Liberius* begged, that, of all Men, he would not chuſe Biſhops for the Inſtruments of his private Revenge. *Conſtantius* made no Reply, but only told him, that he muſt either ſign the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*, or be ſent into Exile; and that he allowed him Three Days to deliberate which of the Two he would chuſe. *Liberius* anſwered, with great Intrepidity, that he had already choſen, and was reſolved; that in Three Days he ſhould not change his Reſolution; and therefore the Emperor might ſend him that Minute to what Place ſoever he pleaſed [t]. The Three Days were not yet expired when the Emperor ſent for him anew to Court, hoping the Fear of Baniſhment had ſoftened him, as it had done moſt others, into a Compliance. But he found him unalterably fixed in the ſame Reſolution; and therefore, deſpairing of being ever able to ſucceed in his Attempt, he ordered him to be conveyed forthwith to *Berœa* in *Thrace* [u]. *Liberius* had not yet left the Palace, when the Emperor ſent him a Preſent of Five hundred Pieces of Gold to defray his Charges; which he ſent back by the ſame Perſon who brought them, ſaying, that the Emperor might want Money to pay his Troops. The like Sum was ſent him by the Empreſs *Euſebia*; which, with the ſame Anſwer, he deſired might be conveyed to the Emperor, adding, that if he knew not how to employ that Sum better, he might beſtow it on *Epictetus*, or *Auxentius* the *Arian* Biſhop of *Milan*, who would be very thankful for it [x]. He left *Milan* Three Days after, and ſet out for the Place of his Exile. His Fate was no ſooner known at *Rome*, than the Clergy, aſſembling the People, bound themſelves by a ſolemn Oath, in their Preſence, not to acknowlege any other for their Biſhop ſo long as *Liberius* lived [y].

His Steadineſs.

He is baniſhed to Berœa *in* Thrace.

Liberius being thus driven from his See, another was placed on it in his room; and the Perſon, whom the Emperor and the *Arian* Faction pitched upon, was one *Felix*, then only Deacon of the Church of *Rome* [a]. But the Clergy could not proceed to a new Election, without an open Violation of the Oath they had taken; the People began to mutiny, and, aſſembling in Crouds, would ſuffer none of the *Arian*

Felix *is choſen in his room.*

[s] Theod. l. 1. c. 13. [t] Id. ib. [u] Id. ib. & Athan. ad Solit. p. 835.
[x] Theod. l. 2. c. 13. Soz. l. 4. c. 11. [y] Marc. & Fauſt. &c. p. 3. Hier. chron.
[a] Athan. ad Solit. p. 861. Ruff. l. 1. c. 22.

Faction

Faction to enter their Churches. The Imperial Palace therefore ſerved inſtead of a Church; Three of the Emperor's Eunuchs repreſented the People; and Three Biſhops, Slaves of the Court, *viz. Epictetus* of *Centumcellæ*, *Acacius* of *Cæſarea*, and *Baſilius* of *Ancyra*, ordained the new-elected Biſhop [b]. Thus was *Felix* choſen, and thus ordained. As *Liberius* was greatly beloved by the People, chiefly on account of his vigorous Oppoſition to *Conſtantius*, the Intruſion of *Felix* occaſioned a great Sedition, in which many loſt their Lives [c]. The Clergy were not ſo zealous in the Cauſe as the People; for great Numbers of them, unmindful of the Oath they had taken, were by Degrees reconciled to *Felix*, and communicated with him [d]; whereas the People continued to abhor and avoid him at leaſt till the Year 357. when *Conſtantius* came to *Rome* [e]. For that Prince, being deſirous to ſee the Metropolis of his Empire, undertook a Journey to *Rome* in the above-mentioned Year, and entered it in Triumph on the 28th of *April* [f]. During his ſhort Stay in that City, the *Roman* Ladies gave a ſignal Inſtance of the Zeal and Affection they ſtill retained for their exiled Biſhop. They thought a more favourable Opportunity could never offer to ſolicit the Emperor for his Return; and therefore, by a private Agreement among themſelves, they preſſed their Husbands, with great Earneſtneſs, to lay hold of it, threatening to abandon them if they did not, and repairing to their Biſhop to ſhare with him the Hardſhips of his Exile. The Husbands, unmoved by ſuch Menaces, which they well knew would never take place, anſwered, that by ſuch an Application they might incur the Diſpleaſure of the Prince, which would prove fatal to them, as well as to the Perſon in whoſe Behalf they interpoſed; whereas, ſhould they themſelves take ſuch a pious and commendable Office upon them, the Reſpect due to their Sex would, in all Likelihood, extort from the Prince the deſired Favour, at leaſt it would reſtrain his Reſentment, and ſtifle all Thoughts of Revenge. The Propoſal was univerſally applauded by the Ladies, unwilling to expoſe their Husbands to the dire Effects of the Emperor's Indignation. On an appointed Day therefore, attiring themſelves in an Apparel ſuitable to their Rank, that the Emperor in ſeeing them might know who they were, and treat them accordingly, they repaired to Court; and being immediately admitted to the Prince's Preſence, they con-

Conſtantius *goes to* Rome.

The Roman *Ladies intercede for* Liberius.

[b] Ath. ib. Hier. ep. 98. Soz. l. 4. c. 24. Socr. l. 2. c. 37. [c] Soz. l. 4. c. 15. [d] Hier. chron. Marc. & Fauſt. p. 3. [e] Athan. ib. Theod. l. 2. c. 14. Ammian. l. 16. p. 72. [f] Ammian. l. 16. p. 69, 72. Idat. chron. Alex.

jured him, with Tears in their Eyes, to take Pity of that great City, of that numerous Flock, bereft of its Paſtor, and, in his Abſence, devoured by ravenous Wolves. This was not at all a courtly Language: however, *Conſtantius*, without betraying the leaſt Emotion, ſaid, *I thought you had a Paſtor. Is not* Felix *as capable of diſcharging the Paſtoral Office as any other?* Felix, replied they, *is deteſted, and avoided by all.* At theſe Words the Emperor firſt look'd grave; but, immediately changing his Gravity into a Smile, *If ſo,* ſaid he, with great Complaiſance, *you muſt have* Liberius *again: I ſhall, without Delay, diſpatch the proper Orders for his Return.* An Edict was accordingly iſſued the very next Day, recalling *Liberius* to govern the Church jointly with *Felix*; for *Conſtantius* thought it inconſiſtent with his Honour, and the Imperial Dignity, to drive *Felix* from the See, on which he himſelf had placed him.

The Emperor promiſes to recall him.

When this Edict was read, in the Preſence of the Emperor, to the People aſſembled in the *Circus*, they applauded it at firſt, by way of Rallery, ſaying, That ſince the Spectators, at the public Sports, were divided into Two Parties, it was juſt and reaſonable there ſhould be Two Biſhops to head them. The Multitude, not ſatisfied with thus pleaſantly expreſſing their Diſſatisfaction, cried out, immediately after, with one Voice, *There is but One God, One Chriſt, One Biſhop* [g]. And yet the Emperor was rather delighted than diſpleaſed with the Humour of the People, and the Liberty they took; for to what happened on this Occaſion *Ammianus Marcellinus* probably alludes, where he writes, that *Conſtantius*, in exhibiting public Sports at *Rome*, was pleaſed with the Liberty they took to rally him, knowing it did not proceed from Pride or Ill-nature [h]. *Theodoret* tells us, that to Acclamations ſo worthy of the *Roman* Piety the Emperor granted the Return of *Liberius* [i]; and with him agree *Sulpitius Severus* [k], and *Ruffinus* [l]. But *Sozomen* [m], and all the Writers of thoſe Times, aſſure us, that his Return did not happen this, but the following Year 358. when he bought it dear, by ſigning the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*, and the Symbol or Creed, compoſed by the *Semi-Arians*, at *Sirmium*, now *Sirmiſh* in *Sclavonia*. *Conſtantius*, at the Requeſt of the *Roman* Ladies and People, promiſed to recall him, as I have related; but it was on Condition, ſays *Sozomen* [n], that he ſhould agree with the Biſhops of the Court, that is, with the *Semi-Arians*.

The Edict recalling him to govern jointly with Felix, *rallied by the* Roman *People.*

[g] Theod. l. 2. c. 14. Soz. l. 4. c. 15. [h] Amm. l. 16. [i] Theod. ib. [k] Sulp. Sever. l. 2. p. 160. [l] Ruf. l. 1. c. 27. [m] Soz. l. 4. c. 11. [n] Idem ib.

The

The Firmneſs which *Liberius* had hitherto ſhewn, left no room to doubt of his rejecting ſuch a Propoſal with the greateſt Indignation. But he now felt what before he had only beheld at a Diſtance: he began to compare the Eaſe and Plenty in which he had lived at *Rome*, with the Inconveniencies and Hardſhips of his preſent Exile. Beſides, from the Menaces thrown out againſt him by the Emperor's Officers, he apprehended his Life to be in Danger [o]. 'Tis true, he had wiſhed for an Opportunity of ſhedding his Blood in ſo good a Cauſe, as I have related above. But who is not brave at a Diſtance from Danger? The Jealouſy he had of *Felix*, who, ſitting in his Chair, acted the High Pontiff at *Rome*, was the *Dalila*, ſays *Baronius* [p], ſpeaking of his ſigning the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*, who bereft this *Samſon* of all his Strength and Courage. However that be, it is certain, that the Strength and Courage, which he had with great Glory exerted on other Occaſions, vaniſhed at once. For he not only ſigned the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*, but moreover approved, and received, as catholic, the Confeſſion or Symbol of *Sirmium* [q]. Thus, to ingratiate himſelf with the Emperor, and return to *Rome*, did *Liberius* abandon, at laſt, his perſecuted Friend, renounce the Catholic Faith, and ſolemnly promiſe to maintain inviolable the Doctrine of *Sirmium* [r]. As he was impatient to be reinſtated in his See, he took care immediately to acquaint the Emperor with the Steps he had taken. With this Letter he diſpatched *Fortunatianus*, Biſhop of *Aquileia*, charging him to ſolicit *Conſtantius* for his Return, ſince he had done all he had required of him [s]. *Conſtantius* took no notice of, nor returned any Anſwer to, this Letter. On the other hand, *Liberius* was heartily ſick of his Exile, heartily ſick of ſuffering for the ſake of Juſtice. In Hopes therefore of putting a ſpeedy End to his Exile, and the Hardſhips attending it, he wrote, in a moſt ſubmiſſive and cringing Style, to the Eaſtern Biſhops, aſſuring them, that it was merely out of Reſpect to his Predeceſſor *Julius*, and to maintain his Judgment, that he had undertaken the Defence of *Athanaſius*; that as ſoon as it had pleaſed God to open his Eyes, and diſcover to him how juſtly he had been condemned, he had ſeparated himſelf from his Communion, and joined them; that all their Decrees concerning him ſhould be inviolably obſerved by the Apoſtolic See, as indeed they ought to be;

Liberius ſigns the Condemnation of Athanaſius, *and embraces the Doctrine of* Sirmium.

His Letter to the Eaſtern Biſhops.

[o] Ath. ad Solit. p. 837. [p] Bar. ad ann. 357. n. 41. [q] Hil. frag. 1. p. 48. Hier. vir. ill. c. 97. [r] Hil. ib. [s] Idem ib. p. 49.

that

that he ſincerely and willingly received the true Catholic and Orthodox Faith, as it had been expounded and defined by ſeveral of his Brethren and Collegues at *Sirmium*, and had been propoſed to him by his Collegue *Demophilus*; that he received every Article of that Symbol, and had nothing to object againſt any. This remarkable Letter he concludes thus: *And now that I agree with you in every Point, let me earneſtly intreat your Holineſſes to employ your joint Intereſt in my Behalf, that I may be recalled from Baniſhment, and ſuffered to return to the See, which God has been pleaſed to commit to my Care* [t]. This Letter has been conveyed to us by the great *Hilarius*, Biſhop of *Poitiers*, who, in relating it, not able to reſtrain the juſt Indignation it kindled in his Breaſt, interrupts the Recital Three times, to anathematize the Author of it, the *prevaricating Liberius*, as he ſtyles him [u]. He wrote likewiſe to *Urſacius*, *Valens*, and *Germinius*, who bore great Sway at Court, and were at the Head of the *Arian* Faction in the Weſt, to acquaint them, that he communicated with them, and alſo with *Auxentius* and *Epictetus*, Two of the moſt inveterate Enemies the Orthodox had; and that whoever did not communicate with them, that is, every Catholic Biſhop, was cut off from his Communion. Theſe Words *Hilarius* cannot repeat without anathematizing anew *Liberius*, and all the *Arians* with him. In the ſame Letter he lets them know, that he has ſeparated himſelf from the Communion of *Athanaſius*, *late Biſhop of* Alexandria, acknowleging him, by that Expreſſion, lawfully depoſed. He declares, in the Beginning of his Letter, and calls God to witneſs, that it is not by Compulſion, but merely for the ſake of Peace and Charity, far preferable to Martyrdom itſelf, that he writes to them. He conjures them, by the omnipotent God, by his Son *Jeſus*, by the Holy Ghoſt, to intercede for him with the Emperor, that, by his Return, Peace and Tranquillity may be reſtored to the Church committed to his Care, aſſuring them, that the Zeal they exert in ſo pious, ſo juſt a Cauſe, will meet with a proportionable Reward in Heaven [w].

He is anathematized by Hilarius.

His Letter to the Biſhops at Court;

As the Emperor had not yet taken the leaſt Notice of his Letter; as the Eaſtern Biſhops, as well as the Biſhops at Court, did not act, as he thought, with all the Zeal and Expedition he expected, and his ready Compliance well deſerved; he wrote a Third Letter, directed to *Vincentius*, Biſhop of *Capua*, acquainting him, that he had abandoned the Defence of *Athanaſius*, and deſiring him to give No-

and to Vincentius, *Biſhop of* Capua.

[t] Idem ib. p. 47, 48. [u] Idem ib. [w] Idem ib. p. 49.

tice thereof to all the Biſhops of *Campania*; and, at the ſame time, to uſe his utmoſt Endeavours to perſuade them to diſpatch ſome of their Body with a Letter, in their common Name, to the Emperor, begging *Conſtantius* to deliver him, without further Delay, from his preſent moſt melancholy and deplorable Situation. To this Letter he adds the following Paragraph, in his own Hand: *We live in Peace with all the Biſhops of the Eaſt, and with you. As for me, I have diſcharged my Conſcience before God. Will you ſuffer me to periſh in my preſent Exile? The ſame God will judge us both* [x]. The Biſhop of *Capua* had been formerly ſent, by *Liberius*, to the Council of *Arles*, with the Character of his Legate, as I have obſerved above, and had there ſigned the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*; on which Occaſion *Liberius* wiſhed for an Opportunity of waſhing out, with his own Blood, the Stain which the Conduct of his Legate had brought upon his Character. But his only Wiſh now was to ſee himſelf delivered from his painful Exile, and reſtored to his former State, upon any Terms. *Vincentius*, touched with his Complaints, prevailed upon the Biſhops of *Campania* to ſend a ſolemn Deputation to the Emperor in his Behalf; which *Conſtantius* complied with, ſo far as to recall him from the Place of his Exile to *Sirmium*, where the Court then was [y]. Upon his Arrival there, *Conſtantius*, who had lately embraced the Doctrine of the *Semi-Arians*, taking Advantage of his Weakneſs, and of the eager Deſire he had betrayed of returning to his See, obliged him, as well as the Biſhops of the Court, and Four *African* Biſhops, who happened to be then at *Sirmium*, to ſign the ſame Doctrine [z]. Thus did the infallible *Liberius* ſign, and embrace, at leaſt in Appearance, both the *Arian* and *Semi-Arian* Hereſy; the *Arian* at *Beræa*, the Place of his Exile, and the *Semi-Arian* at *Sirmium*. That the Confeſſion he ſigned at *Beræa* was *Arian*, cannot be doubted; for it was the Second of *Sirmium*, which all agree to have been *Arian* (A). Beſides, it was propoſed to him by

He is recalled from his Baniſhment to Sirmium.

He ſigns the Doctrine of the Semi-Arians.

[x] Idem ib. p. 51. [y] Soz. l. 4. c. 15. [z] Idem ib.

(A) Three Councils were held at *Sirmium*, one in 349. another in 352. and the Third in 357. In the Firſt, *Photinus*, Biſhop of that City, was condemned, for reviving the Hereſy of *Paul* of *Samoſata*. This Council was intirely compoſed of the Weſtern Biſhops, who attempted to depoſe *Photinus*, but were vigorouſly oppoſed by the People. The Second Council of *Sirmium* was convened by the Emperor *Conſtantius*, and conſiſted of the Eaſtern Biſhops only, who condemned anew, and depoſed *Photinus*. By this Council a Symbol, or Creed, was compoſed, which has been tranſmitted to us in *Greek* by St. *Athanaſius*, and in *Latin* by St. *Hilarius*; and is intirely

by *Demophilus*, Biſhop of *Beræa*, who was a moſt zealous Stickler for *Arianiſm*, and greatly attached to *Urſacius* and *Valens*, the Two leading Men among the *Arians* in the Weſt; and it is not at all probable, that he would have required *Liberius* to ſign a Doctrine different from that which he himſelf held.

The Advocates for the Pope's Infallibility are here quite at a Loſs what to ſay in Defence of that Prerogative. That *Liberius* ſigned the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*, that he communicated with the *Arians*, and, what above all galls them, that he received the *Sirmian* Confeſſion of Faith as Catholic and Orthodox, are undeniable Matters of Fact. To reconcile them with Infallibility, is what they have been long drudging at: and to what pitiful Shifts, what eluding and unmeaning Diſtinctions, have they not been obliged to recur! like a Man ſtruggling for Life in deep Water, and catching at every Twig to ſave it, they flounce from Quibble to Quibble, from one Subterfuge to another, but all in vain; ſink they muſt, and their Infallibility with them. To ſhew their Diſtreſs, I ſhall briefly tranſcribe what I find offered on this Occaſion, by the moſt learned among them, in Defence of the Cauſe they have undertaken. *Baronius* [b], after relating and owning the above-mentioned Facts, addreſſes his Readers thus: *We have hitherto ſailed among dangerous Rocks, among treacherous Sholes; but fear not, I ſhall at laſt pilot you ſafe into the Port of Truth.* Then, dropping his Allegory, he makes a long Deſcant to prove, that the *Sirmian* Confeſſion of Faith, ſigned by *Liberius*, was, in every Article, Catholic and Orthodox. A rare Pilot indeed! If this (to purſue his Allegory) is *the Port of Truth*, who can help pitying *Jerom*, *Hilarius*, *Athanaſius*, and in ſhort all the Antients? for they certainly miſſed it, and, falling in among thoſe *dan-*

What alleged by Baronius *in his Defence*;

[b] Bar. ad ann. 357. n. 46.

intirely Orthodox. In the Third Council of *Sirmium* a new Creed was compoſed by *Potamius*, Biſhop of *Liſbone*, and ſigned by *Urſacius*, *Valens*, *Germinius*, and the other Biſhops there preſent. This Creed was altogether *Arian*; for not only the Word *Conſubſtantial* was rejected by it, but the Son was declared to be unlike the Father in Eſſence, to be leſs than the Father, and to have had a Beginning. And it was this Second Symbol of *Sirmium* that *Liberius* ſigned at *Beræa*. Upon his Arrival at *Sirmium* he found there *Baſilius* of *Ancyra*, *Eleuſius* of *Cyzicus*, and the other *Semi-Arian* Biſhops, who were lately come from the Council of *Ancyra*, where they had condemned the Doctrine of the *Pure Arians*, and eſtabliſhed that of the *Semi-Arians*, holding the Son to be like the Father in Nature and Eſſence, but not *Conſubſtantial*, or of the ſame Subſtance. And this Doctrine *Liberius* ſigned out of Complaiſance to the Emperor, that nothing might obſtruct his Return to *Rome*. He ſigned it in a kind of Council, conſiſting of the *Semi-Arian* Biſhops, whom I have mentioned above.

gerous Rocks, thoſe treacherous Sholes, which *Baronius* had the Skill and good Luck to avoid, were there unfortunately ſhipwrecked. For *Jerom* ſays, in expreſs Terms, and in Two Places [c], that *Liberius* ſigned an Hereſy; *Hilarius*, that he approved of the *Arian* Perfidy [d]; *Athanaſius*, that he joined the *Arians* [e]; and all the Antients, that he apoſtatized from the Faith: nay, *Liberius* himſelf, in his Letter to the Orientals, which is ſtill to be ſeen, under his own Hand, in the *Vatican* Library, gives them Notice, that *in all things* he agrees with *Demophilus*, a moſt zealous *Arian*, and with them; which Words *Hilarius* could not repeat without anathematizing him. It is therefore manifeſt, beyond all Diſpute, that the Confeſſion of Faith, ſigned by *Liberius*, was not Catholic, but *Arian*. Of this *Baronius* himſelf was, without Doubt, well appriſed, and into this Port he had piloted his Reader, had Truth alone been his Land-mark. *Bellarmine*, the other great Stickler for Infallibility, purſues a different Method, but with worſe Succeſs, in my Opinion, than his Fellow-Champion *Baronius*; for, by ſtriving to ſupport that chimerical Prerogative, he evidently overſets it. The Pope, according to him, may ſign and receive heretical Opinions, as *Liberius* did, without prejudicing in the leaſt his Infallibility, provided he does not internally aſſent to them [f]; ſo that the ſo much boaſted Infallibility is, by him, reduced at laſt to this: that the Pope cannot internally aſſent to an Error; which is confining his Infallibility to himſelf, and conſequently diſqualifying him for the Office of a Teacher. Infallibility, even thus curtailed, is, no doubt, a moſt valuable Treaſure to the Owner, but of no more Uſe to the reſt of Mankind than a Treaſure concealed under-ground; and, on that very Account, it ought in common Senſe to be exploded. But it is ſcarce worth the while to quarrel with *Bellarmine* about it, ſince he cannot be ſo unreaſonable as to require us, in virtue of ſuch a Prerogative, to pay any Regard to the Deciſions of the Pope, till ſuch time, at leaſt, as we know them to be agreeable to his private Opinion; and this is what we can never know, ſince every Pope may, like *Liberius*, externally admit an Opinion as true; and, at the ſame time, internally reject it as falſe.

and by Bellarmine.

Liberius returns to Rome.

But, to return to *Liberius*; he was at laſt, in regard of his ready Compliance with the Will of the Emperor, allowed to return to

[c] Hier. vir. ill. c. 97. & in chron. Hil. frag. 2. p. 48. [e] Athan. ad Solit.
[f] Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 9.

Rome;

Rome; but on Condition, that he ſhould govern jointly with *Felix* [g]. Letters were accordingly diſpatched both to *Felix*, and the *Roman* Clergy, to acquaint them therewith. *Sozomen* ſeems to inſinuate, that they both governed thus for ſome time [h]. But, according to St. *Jerom*, and the Two Presbyters *Marcellinus* and *Fauſtinus*, who lived then at *Rome*, and were Eye-witneſſes of what they relate, *Felix* was driven not only from the See, but out of the City, as ſoon as *Liberius* entered it; which he did on the 2d of *Auguſt* 358. in a kind of Triumph, being met and received by the whole People, with loud Acclamations of Joy [i]. *Felix* returned ſoon after, at the Inſtigation of a few of the Eccleſiaſtics, who had, contrary to their Oath, adhered to him; and even attempted to perform Divine Service in the Baſilic of *Julius*, beyond the *Tiber*; but the enraged Multitude drove him out a Second time, and, with him, all the Eccleſiaſtics, who had acknowleged him [k]. *Socrates* writes, that the Emperor himſelf was in the End obliged to give him up, and conſent to his Expulſion [l]. Mention is made in the Pontificals of a bloody Perſecution, raiſed in *Rome* by *Liberius*, and his Party, againſt the Partiſans of *Felix*, who, it is ſaid, were inhumanly murdered in the Streets, in the Baths, in all public Places, and even in the Churches [m]. But as none of the Antients take the leaſt Notice of ſuch Cruelties, I will not charge *Liberius* with them, upon the bare Authority of ſuch Records. *Felix*, being driven from *Rome*, withdrew to a ſmall Eſtate he had on the Road to *Porto*, and there ſpent the remaining Part of his Life in Retirement [n]. *Sozomen* ſuppoſes him to have died ſoon after [o]. But the Two Presbyters *Marcellinus* and *Fauſtinus*, who muſt have been better informed, aſſure us, that he lived Seven Years after the Return of *Liberius*, and died on the 22d of *November* 365 [p].

Felix is driven out.

Concerning *Felix*, all the Antients agree, that he was unlawfully elected and ordained; that he communicated with the *Arians*; that, to ingratiate himſelf with them, and the Emperor, he ſigned the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*; that he was guilty of Perjury in accepting the Epiſcopal Dignity, having bound himſelf, with the reſt of the Clergy, by a ſolemn Oath, to acknowlege no other Biſhop while *Liberius* lived; and, laſtly, that he ſtrove to keep Poſſeſſion of the

The Judgment of the Antients concerning Felix.

[g] Soz. l. 4. c. 15. [h] Idem ib. [i] Hier. chron. Mar. & Fauſt. p. 4. [k] Idem ib. [l] Socr. l. 2. c. 37. [m] Anaſt. c. 37. Boll. Apr. t. 1. p. 31. [n] Theod. l. 2. c. 13. Philg. l. 4. c. 3. [o] Soz. l. 4. c. 15. [p] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 4.

Roman

Roman See, after the Return of the lawful Bishop, and to sit in it, together with him, in open Defiance of the Canons of the Church. *Socrates* adds, that he not only communicated with the *Arians*, but was infected with the *Arian* Heresy [q]. *Athanasius* styles him *a Monster, raised to the See of* Rome *by the Malice of Antichrist, one worthy of those who raised him, and in every respect well qualified for the Execution of their wicked Designs* [r]. And yet this Heretic, this Monster, this Intruder, or Antipope, is honoured (the Reader will be surprised to hear it), is honoured by the Church of *Rome* as a Saint; nay, as a Martyr; and his Festival is kept to this Day, on the 29th of *July*. This Honour was conferred on him in the Ages of Darkness and Ignorance, upon the Authority of his fabulous Acts, and a more fabulous Pontifical, from which his Acts seem to have been copied. In the Pontifical it is said, that *Felix* declared *Constantius*, who had been twice baptized, an Heretic; and was therefore, by an Order from the incensed Emperor, apprehended, and privately beheaded, with many Ecclesiastics and Laymen, under the Walls of *Rome*, on the 11th of *November*. It is added, That the Presbyter *Damasus* privately conveyed his Body to a Church, which *Felix* had built, and there interred it; and that, upon his Death, the See remained vacant for the Space of Thirty-eight Days [s]. In the Acts of *Felix* we read, that *Constantius* was rebaptized by *Eusebius*, Bishop of *Nicomedia*; that *Felix* having, on that Account, declared him an Heretic, he was driven from the See of *Rome*, and *Liberius* replaced on it; that *Felix* thereupon retired into the Country, but was brought back by the Emperor's Orders, and beheaded on the 10th of *November*; that his Body was interred on the 20th of the same Month, in a Church, which he had built while he was a Presbyter: And we keep his Festival, adds the Author, on the 29th of *July* [t]. *Anastasius* has copied the Pontifical Word for Word, except that he pretends *Felix* to have been beheaded at *Cora*, in the *Campagna* of *Rome* [u]; though he has told us, in the foregoing Page, that he *died in Peace*, a Phrase never used in speaking of Martyrs, on the 29th of *July*, at his Estate on the Road to *Porto* [w]. The City of *Cere*, now *Cerventera*, in *Tuscany*, honours *Felix* to this Day, as their chief Patron or Protector. In those dark Times Legends alone were in request, and all other Books, even the Scripture itself, quite out of

He is honoured by the Church of Rome *as a Saint and a Martyr.*

His fabulous Acts.

[q] Socrat. l. 2. c. 37. [r] Athan. ad Solit. p. 861. [s] Vide Bolland. Apr. t. 1. p. 31.
[t] MS. p. 219. [u] Anast. c. 37. p. 22. [w] Idem ib. p. 21.

Date,

Date, and neglected. No Wonder therefore that ſuch Abſurdities, however inconſiſtent with Hiſtory, were ſwallowed without ſtraining; and *Felix*, for his pretended Zeal and Conſtancy, ranked among the holy Martyrs. For I may venture to affirm, that the moſt learned Men, at that time, in the Church, knew nothing of *Felix* but what they had learned from his fabulous Acts, and from the above-mentioned Pontifical. That I may not be thought to exaggerate, I ſhall allege one Inſtance of the Ignorance of paſt Times: *Gulielmus a Sancto Amore*, one of the moſt learned Men of the 13th Century, knew that, in the Time of *Hilarius*, Biſhop of *Poitiers*, a Pope, with moſt of the Biſhops, had fallen into Hereſy. He did not even pretend to be ſo well verſed in Hiſtory as to know for certain who the Pope was; but, indulging a Conjecture, which he thought probable enough, he named *Anaſtaſius* II. who died in 498. about 150 Years after the Time of *Hilarius*: ſo that he was an utter Stranger to the Hiſtory of Pope *Liberius*, and conſequently to that of the Antipope *Felix*. Had it not been for the like Ignorance in more early Times, the Apotheoſis of our pretended Martyr had never taken Place. Be that as it will, during the Ages of Darkneſs he held undiſturbed the Rank, to which he had been thus raiſed: but when the Dawn of Knowlege began to appear, and it was diſcovered at laſt from cotemporary and unexceptionable Writers, who *Felix* was, the Church of *Rome* was aſhamed to own him among her Saints. On the other hand, to degrade him had been giving a fatal Blow to the Pope's Authority, and rendering it for ever precarious, in ſo material a Point as that of Canonization. *Felix* therefore was, at all Events, to keep his Place in Heaven; his Sanctity was to be confirmed, and the World impoſed upon by ſome Contrivance or other, capable of utterly defeating the Teſtimony of the Antients.

How he came to be honoured as a Saint.

His Sanctity called in queſtion;

This Point being ſettled, to prevent all Suſpicion of Deceit, or underhand Dealings, Pope *Gregory* XIII. declared, in 1582. his Intention of having the Cauſe of *Felix* impartially examined. In order to this, he appointed *Baronius*, employed at that Time in reforming the *Roman* Martyrology, to put in Writing whatever could be objected againſt *Felix*, and Cardinal *Santorio* to anſwer his Objections, and collect likewiſe in Writing all that could be ſaid in favour of his new Client, that the Pope might be thoroughly acquainted with the Merits of the Cauſe before he came to a final Deciſion. This Conduct in *Gregory* has been cenſured by ſome over-zealous Divines of the Church

and his Cauſe re-examined.

of *Rome*, as if he had thereby given the World Occaſion to think that he queſtioned the Infallibility of his Predeceſſors, who had honoured *Felix* as a Saint [x]. But *Gregory* well knew what he was doing, and how the Whole would end. In Compliance with his Orders *Baronius* wrote a Diſſertation, which he himſelf calls a Volume, and not a ſhort one [y], to prove that *Felix* was neither a Saint, nor a Martyr. As he had Truth on his Side, Cardinal *Santorio*, though a Man of Learning, could neither anſwer his Arguments, nor offer any thing in ſo deſperate a Cauſe worthy of himſelf. He often addreſſed himſelf in his Prayers to his Client, intreating him to undertake his own Cauſe, by ſuggeſting to him what might be alleged in his Defence. But the Client was no leſs at a Stand than the Advocate. Some other Perſon therefore muſt interpoſe: And whom did the carrying or loſing ſuch a Cauſe more nearly concern than the Pope, ſince his Authority in a moſt eſſential Point was at Stake? This was a nice Affair, and to be managed with great Art and Dexterity. *Gregory*, therefore, having often heard both Sides, in a full Congregation of Cardinals, without betraying the leaſt Partiality for *Felix*, appointed them to meet for the laſt time on the 28th of *July*, the Eve of the pretended Saint's Feſtival, judging that the moſt proper Time to play off with good Succeſs the Trick, which he had kept the whole Time *in petto*. The Cardinals met on the Day appointed; *Baronius* quite ſilenced his Adverſary; the whole Aſſembly was fully convinced, that *Felix* was no Saint, no Martyr; the Pope himſelf ſeemed to fall in with the reſt, and accordingly roſe up to declare, as was thought, the unhappy *Felix* fallen from Heaven; when a great Noiſe was all on a ſudden heard at the Door, and immediately a Meſſenger entered, who, after uttering theſe Words, *Holy* Felix, *pray for us*, acquainted the Pope and the Cardinals, that the Body of *Felix* was juſt diſcovered. Hereupon they all repaired in great haſte to the Church of *Coſmas* and *Damianus*, where the miraculous Diſcovery had been made; and there ſaw, in a Marble Coffin of an extraordinary Size, on one Side the Bodies of *Mark*, *Marcellianus*, and *Tranquillinus*; and on the other that of *Felix*, with this Inſcription on a Stone that lay by it, *The Body of Saint* Felix, *who condemned* Conſtantius [z]. Hereupon the *Te Deum* was ſung with great Solemnity for the Triumph of Truth: *Felix* was declared worthy of the Veneration and Worſhip that had till then been

His Sanctity and Martyrdom confirmed by the Diſcovery of his Body.

[x] Leucheſini de infall. ſed. Rom. p. 97. Roſſi vicario di Criſto, p. 72. [y] Par. ad ann. 557. n. 63. [z] Idemib.

paid

paid him, and a Place was allowed him among the other Saints in the *Roman* Martyrology, where it is ſaid, that *he was driven from his See for defending the Catholic Faith, by* Conſtantius *an* Arian *Emperor, and privately put to Death at* Cere, *now* Cervetera, *in* Tuſcany. *Baronius*, tranſported with Joy, as he himſelf declares [a], at ſo miraculous and ſeaſonable a Diſcovery, immediately yielded, not to his Antagoniſt *Santorio*, but to *Felix*, who had evidently interpoſed; and, taking that Interpoſition for a ſatisfactory Anſwer to all his Arguments, he immediately retracted whatever he had ſaid, and conſigned to the Flames whatever he had written in Oppoſition to *Felix* [b]. Thus, to maintain a chimerical Prerogative, they ſport with Truth; betray into Error thoſe who confide in them; and, turning the worſt of Men into Saints, honour Vice with the greateſt Reward they can beſtow on Virtue.

His Legend proved to be fabulous.

That this pretended Diſcovery was nothing but a Contrivance to confirm the Martyrdom of *Felix*, and impoſe upon the World, is manifeſt; and that the Pontifical, and his Acts, on which his Martyrdom was originally founded, were a no leſs palpable and groſs Impoſition, may be eaſily demonſtrated. For, in the firſt place, *Marcellinus* and *Fauſtinus*, who lived in the Time of *Felix* and *Liberius* at *Rome*, tell us, in expreſs Terms, that *Felix*, *who had been ſubſtituted to* Liberius, *died on the* 22*d of* November 365 [c], that is, Four Years after the Death of *Conſtantius*, by whom he is ſaid, in his Acts, and in the Pontifical, to have been martyred. *Athanaſius* aſſures us [d], and with him agree *Philoſtorgius* [e], and the Chronicle of *Alexandria* [f], that *Conſtantius* was not baptized till at the Point of Death, when he received that Sacrament at the Hands of *Euzoius*, the *Arian* Biſhop of *Antioch*. And yet both the Acts of *Felix*, and the Pontifical, will have him to have been twice baptized before his Death; for it was on this Account that *Felix* is ſaid to have declared him an Heretic. This Declaration *Baronius* improves into a ſolemn Excommunication; and, being become, after the above-mentioned Diſcovery, a moſt zealous Advocate for *Felix*, tells us, that the holy Martyr was no ſooner placed on the Throne of St. *Peter*, than, changing his Conduct, he ſeparated himſelf from the Communion of thoſe by whom he had been raiſed, and boldly thundered an Anathema againſt the Emperor himſelf [g].

[a] Id. ib. n. 64. [b] Id. ib. [c] Marcell. & Fauſt. p. 4. [d] Athan. de ſyn. p. 907. [e] Philoſt. l. 6. c. 6. [f] Chron. Alex. p. 684. [g] Bar. ad ann. 357. n. 65.

He did not excommunicate Constantius.

What a Pity that *Athanasius* was not better acquainted with the Conduct of *Felix!* for if he had, he would never have styled him *a Monster placed on the See of* Rome *by the Malice of Antichrist.* Such an Attempt, unheard of till that Time, must have made a great Noise; and yet I find it was heard by none but *Baronius*, who lived at so great a Distance. I may add, that there was no room for an Excommunication against *Constantius*, who was still a Catechumen, and consequently did not partake of the sacred Mysteries.

Whether a lawful Pope or an Antipope.

The *Roman* Catholic Writers, to save the Credit of *Felix*, maintain him to have been, at least for some time, lawful Pope. But, to confute whatever has been or can be said by them in his Favour, without entering into a Detail of the many sophistical and unconclusive Arguments, false Assertions, and groundless Suppositions, with which they endeavour to disguise the Truth, and confound their Readers, I argue thus: That *Liberius* was lawfully chosen, and *Felix* unlawfully, is past all Dispute. Now, upon the Fall of *Liberius*, either there was, or there was not, a new Election: if there was not, *Liberius* continued to be lawful Bishop; or if by his Fall he forfeited his Dignity, as some think he did, the See became vacant; for nothing subsequent to the unlawful Election of *Felix* could render it lawful. If there was a new Election, and *Felix* was lawfully chosen, *Liberius* from that Minute either ceased to be Pope, or there were Two lawful Popes at a time. The latter they will not admit, lest they should turn the Church into a Monster with Two Heads. They must therefore allow *Felix* to have been lawful Pope, and *Liberius* an Antipope, till the See became vacant by the Death of the former. But, on the other hand, this new Election is quite groundless, highly improbable, and absolutely repugnant to what we read in the antient and cotemporary Writers. It is quite groundless; for though *Bellarmine* speaks of a new Election with as much Confidence as if he had been one of the Electors [h], yet we find not the least Hint of it in any of the Writers of those Times, who would not have passed over in Silence so remarkable an Event, had it come to their Knowlege. It is highly improbable; for *Liberius* was greatly beloved by the whole People, and the far greater Part of the Clergy, and *Felix* hated to such a Degree, that, of all the Inhabitants of *Rome*, not one ever

Felix *an Antipope.*

[h] Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 9.

appeared

appeared in the Church while he was in it [i]; nay, he was by all avoided, even in the Streets and other public Places, as if he had carried about with him a Contagion [k]. Is it not therefore altogether improbable, that the People and Clergy ſhould depoſe the Man, whom in a manner they adored, for communicating with the *Arians*, and appoint one in his room, who likewiſe communicated with them, and was univerſally deteſted, avoided, and abhorred? And yet all this is gravely ſuppoſed by *Bellarmine* [l]. Laſtly, the Election of *Felix* is repugnant to what we read in the antient Writers, who all ſpeak of him as an Antipope, and an Intruder. *Optatus*, who lived at that very Time, and St. *Auſtin*, who flouriſhed ſoon after, have not allowed him a Place in their Catalogues of the Biſhops of *Rome*. *Theodoret* takes no notice of him in his Catalogue of the Biſhops of the chief Cities. St. *Jerom* and *Proſper* count *Liberius* the Thirty-fourth Biſhop of *Rome*, and *Damaſus*, who ſucceeded him, the Thirty-fifth; a plain Indication that they did not look upon *Felix* as lawful Biſhop. Among the Moderns, *Onuphrius Panvinius*, in his Lives of the Popes, printed in 1557. ſome Years before the Diſcovery of *Felix*'s Body, calls *Novatian* the Firſt Antipope, and *Felix* the Second. But his Book was prohibited in 1583. the Year after the Second Canonization of *Felix*. The Writers, who came after, took Warning; and ſuch of them as thought it baſe to concur in deceiving Mankind, ſince it was not ſafe to undeceive them, choſe to wave this Subject, but not without giving ſome broad Hints of what they believed in their Hearts. Thus *F. Labbé* [m], and Cardinal *Bona* [n], take no notice of this *Felix*, but call Pope *Felix*, who was raiſed to the See of *Rome* in 485. the Second Pope of that Name. *Felix* I. was martyred under *Aurelian* in 274. as we have related elſewhere [o]. *F. Labbé*, at the Death of *Felix* II. which happened in 492. adds, that he was the Third of that Name, according to *Baronius* [p]. Had *Felix* never been canonized, no Man would have been ſo regardleſs of his own Reputation as to undertake his Defence; but *Gregory* having declared him a Saint, and, by ſuch a Declaration, linked his Cauſe with Infallibility in a moſt eſſential Point, the hired Champions of that See found themſelves under an indiſpenſable Obligation of entering the Liſts; which I need not ſay they have done to no Purpoſe.

Acknowleged as ſuch by ſome Roman *Catholic Writers.*

[i] Theodoret. p. 610. [k] Athan. ad Solit. p. 861. [l] Bell. ibid. [m] Lab. chron. [n] Bona, lit. l. 2. c. 11. p. 423. [o] Vide p. 78. [p] Lab. ibid.

The Emperor undertakes the eſtabliſhing of Arianiſm.

The Fall of the Biſhop of *Rome*, who was at the Head of the orthodox Party, inſpired the Emperor with great Hopes of ſucceeding in the Deſign he had formed of utterly aboliſhing the orthodox Faith; he found there were but few Biſhops whoſe Virtue was Proof againſt the Frowns and Reſentment of the Court. In the Council held at *Arles* in 353. they had all to a Man choſen rather to communicate with the *Arians*, than be driven from their Sees: in that which was convened Two Years after, at *Milan*, only Three Biſhops were found, *viz.* *Dionyſius* Biſhop of that City, *Lucifer* of *Cagliari*, and *Euſebius* of *Vercelli*, who, equally unmoved by Threats and Promiſes, had maintained the Truth with the Loſs of their Dignity. The Example of the Biſhop of *Rome* had been followed by the far greater Part of the Biſhops of *Italy*. But what above all encouraged the Emperor to purſue the Scheme he had ſo much at heart, was the Fall of the celebrated *Oſius* Biſhop of *Cordoua*, in the Hundredth Year of his Age, and Sixty-ſecond of his Epiſcopacy. As the Name of *Oſius* is one of the moſt famous in the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of thoſe Times, and his Fall is alleged by the Antients as a memorable Inſtance of the Weakneſs of Human Nature, however ſtrengthened and improved by a long Practice of the moſt eminent Virtues, a ſuccinct Account of ſo remarkable an Event will not, I hope, be unacceptable to the Reader, or thought foreign to the Subject in hand.

A ſuccinct Account of the Life of Oſius *Biſhop of* Cordoua.

Oſius was a Native of *Spain* [p], born, according to ſome, in *Cordoua*, about the Year 256. and raiſed, in regard of his extraordinary Merit, to the See of that City in 295 [q]. He was even then conſpicuous for the Firmneſs of his Faith, and the Purity of his Life, ſays *Sozomen* [r]. *Athanaſius*, who was well acquainted with him, ſpeaks of him with the greateſt Reſpect and Eſteem, calling him a Man truly holy, according to the *Greek* Signification of his Name; one in whoſe Conduct even his moſt inveterate Enemies could diſcover nothing that was not commendable, his Life being irreprehenſible, and his Reputation unſpotted [s]. *Theodoret* [t], and *Euſebius* [u], extol him on Account of his extraordinary Prudence, Wiſdom, and Learning, which gave great Weight to his Opinion in the many Councils at which he aſſiſted, and often preſided. In the Year 300. he was preſent at the Council of *Eliberis*, or *Illeberis*, in *Spain*, famous for the Severity of its Canons, and, in all Likelihood, made even then a

[p] Athan. ad Sol. p. 838. [q] Soz. l. 1. c. 16. [r] Id. ib. [s] Athan. ad Sol. p. 841. [t] Theod. l. 1. c. 6. [u] Euſeb. vit. Conſt. l. 2. c. 63.

con-

conſiderable Figure; ſince, in the Acts of that Council, he is named in the Second Place after *Felix* of *Acci*, now *Guadix*, in *Andaluſia*, who probably preſided [w]. Three Years after broke out the Perſecution of *Maximian Hercules*, in which *Oſius* diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his Zeal, his Conſtancy, and his Sufferings; for, having with great Intrepidity confeſſed his Faith before the Pagan Magiſtrates, he was by them impriſoned, and kept under a very cloſe and painful Confinement for the Space of Two Years, that is, from the Year 303. to 305. when, upon the Abdication of *Maximian* and *Diocleſian*, he was ſet at Liberty by *Conſtantius Chlorus*, the Father of *Conſtantine the Great* [x]. He is honoured by *Athanaſius* [y], by the Council of *Sardica*, and by moſt of the Antients, with the Title of *Confeſſor*, which was given to ſuch as had ſuffered Impriſonment, Torments, or Exile, but had not died for the Confeſſion of the Faith. He was highly eſteemed and revered by *Conſtantine*, not only as a Confeſſor, but as a Perſon of extraordinary Wiſdom and Probity [z]; whence he is thought to have been one of the Prelates whom that Prince conſulted in 311 [a], and kept with him to inſtruct him in the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion. Some think that *Oſius* was meant by the *Egyptian* Prieſt come from *Spain*, to whom *Zoſimus* aſcribes the Change made by *Conſtantine* in point of Religion [b]. The Church of *Cordoua* was, out of Regard to him, inriched by *Conſtantine* with many valuable Preſents, whence he is ſaid to have been very rich [c]. But what Uſe he made of his Wealth we may learn from *Athanaſius*, who aſſures us, that no one in Want ever applied to him without being relieved, and receiving the Supply he demanded [d]. In the famous Diſpute, which I have taken notice of in its proper Place between *Cæcilianus* and the *Donatiſts* of *Africa*, *Oſius* undertook, with great Zeal, the Defence of the former, and prevailed in the End upon *Conſtantine* to eſpouſe his Cauſe, and declare againſt the *Donatiſts* [e], whom he thenceforth puniſhed with great Severity, taking their Churches from them, and ſending the moſt obſtinate among them into Exile. *Conſtantine* being become Maſter of the Eaſt in the Year 323. his firſt Care was to put an End to the unhappy Diviſions that reigned in thoſe Churches about the Celebration of *Eaſter*, and ſome other controverted Points. With

He is impriſoned under Maximian *for the Confeſſion of the Faith.*

He inſtructs Conſtantine.

[w] Concil. tom. 1. p. 969. [x] Ath. ad Sol. p. 838. Euſeb. vit. Conſt. l. 2. c. 63. [y] Ath. ib. apol. 2. p. 760. & alibi. [z] Euſeb. ib. Socr. l. 1. c. 7. [a] Euſeb. ib. l. 1. c. 7. [b] Zoſ. l. 2. p. 435. [c] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 34. [d] Ath. de fug. p. 704. [e] Aug. in Parm. l. 1. c. 8.

this

He is sent by him to compose some Disputes there.

this View he dispatched *Osius* into the East, who, upon his Arrival there, summoned a Council to meet at *Alexandria*, which, under his Influence, condemned the Heresy of *Sabellius*, put a Stop to the Schism of one *Colluthus*, and greatly allayed the Animosity of the contending Parties about the Day on which *Easter* was to be kept [f]. On his Return to Court, the Account he gave of the *Arians*, whose Heresy he had endeavoured in vain to suppress, made so deep an Impression in the Mind of the Emperor, that, for a long time, he continued highly prejudiced against them [g]. It was at the Suggestion of *Osius* that *Constantine* assembled the Council of *Nice* in 325. at which he assisted, and distinguished himself above the rest [h]; for of all Councils he was the Head and Leader, as *Athanasius* styles him [i]. By him was worded and drawn up the famous *Nicene* Symbol or Creed, as we are told in express Terms by *Athanasius* [k]. He presided at the Council of *Sardica*, which, at his Request, was assembled by the Emperor *Constans* in 347 [l]. From that Council he retired to his Bishoprick, and continued there undisturbed till the Year 355. when *Constantius* seeing himself Master of the West, as well as of the East, undertook to oblige all the Bishops to condemn *Athanasius*, whose Cause was looked upon as inseparable from that of the orthodox Faith. As *Osius* had on all Occasions declared highly in his Favour, and the Example of a Prelate so venerable for his Age, for the glorious Title of Confessor, and the Figure he had made for many Years in the Church, greatly prejudiced the World against the Enemies of the persecuted Bishop, the Emperor resolved to deprive, if possible, the Orthodox Party, of so powerful a Support. With this View he ordered *Osius* to repair to *Milan*, where the Court then was, well knowing that he was not, like most other Bishops, to be terrified with threatening Letters. *Osius*, in Compliance with the Emperor's Orders, set out without Delay from *Cordoua*, notwithstanding his great Age; and, arriving at *Milan*, was there received by the Emperor with all the Respect that was due to the *Father of Bishops*, as he was styled. *Constantius* entertained him for some Days with the utmost Civility, hoping by that means to bring him into his Views; but he no sooner named *Athanasius* to him, than the zealous Prelate, well knowing the Drift of his Discourse, and armed against all Temptations, inter-

He assists at the Council of Nice, *and draws up the* Nicene *Creed.*

Constantius *attempts in vain to gain him over to the* Arian *Party.*

[f] Euseb. vit. Const. l. 2. c. 73. [g] Socr. l. 1. c. 8. [h] Sulp. l. 2. c. 55. Theod. l. 2. c. 12. [i] Athan. fug. p. 703. [k] Athan. ad Sol. p. 837. [l] Hil. frag. 2. p. 16.

rupted him with declaring, that he was ready to ſacrifice not One, but a Thouſand Lives, in ſo juſt a Cauſe; nay, he even reprimanded the Emperor with great Freedom, who, out of an awful Reverence for a Prelate of his Years, Authority, and Figure, heard him with great Patience, and not only forbore offering him any Violence, but gave him Leave to return unmoleſted to his See [m].

His ſecond Attempt to gain him.

The mild Treatment *Oſius* met with gave great Uneaſineſs to the *Arian* Party, eſpecially to the Two Biſhops, *Urſacius* and *Valens*, who thereupon never ceaſed ſoliciting the Emperor to proceed with Vigour againſt the only Man, who, they ſaid, was capable of obſtructing his great and pious Deſigns. They were powerfully ſeconded by the Eunuchs, who prevailed in the End upon the Emperor, as they bore a great Sway at Court, to try anew the Firmneſs and Conſtancy of ſo celebrated a Champion. *Conſtantius* therefore wrote ſeveral Letters to him, treating him in ſome with great Reſpect, and ſtyling him his Father, but menacing him in others, and naming to him the Biſhops, whom he had baniſhed for refuſing to condemn a Man whom moſt Biſhops, and ſeveral Councils, had already condemned [n]. *Oſius*, inflexible and unmoved, anſwered the Emperor by a Letter worthy of himſelf, and the great Reputation he had acquired. It has been conveyed to us by *Athanaſius*, and nothing can be ſaid ſtronger in that Biſhop's Defence; for he there ſhews unanſwerably, that, whatever Crimes might be alleged againſt him, his only Guilt was a ſteady Adherence to the Faith of *Nice* [o]. But *Conſtantius*, without hearkening to the Reaſons he urged in Juſtification of his own and *Athanaſius*'s Conduct, without paying the leaſt Regard to the earneſt Prayers and Intreaties, to the paternal Exhortations and Admonitions, of ſo venerable a Prelate, ordered him to quit his See forthwith, and repair to *Sirmium*, where he was kept a whole Year in a kind of Exile. But, unaffected with the many Hardſhips he ſuffered there, with the Loſs of his Dignity, with the inhuman Treatment of his Relations, who were all perſecuted, ſtripped of their Eſtates, and reduced to Beggary on his Account, *Oſius* ſtill ſtood up in Defence of *Athanaſius*, ſtill rejected with Indignation the Propoſals of his Enemies [p], ſtriving to induce him at leaſt to communicate with them. They therefore reſolved to proceed to open Force, and either to gain over to their Party a Man of his Figure and Rank, or, by removing him out of the

His Letter to the Emperor.

He is ſent to Sirmium.

[m] Ath. ad Sol. p. 837—841. [n] Id. ib. p. 838. [o] Id. ib. p. 838—840.
[p] Athan. ib. p. 841. Sulp. l. 2. p. 162. Socr. l. 2. c. 31.

Way,

Way, to deprive the Orthodox of their main Support [q]. Accordingly, with the Emperor's Conſent and Approbation, they cauſed him firſt to be cloſely confined, and afterwards to be cruelly beaten; and laſtly to be put to the Rack, and moſt inhumanly tortured, as if he had been the worſt of Criminals [r]. Even againſt ſuch exquiſite Torments the Firmneſs of his Mind was proof for ſome time; but the Weakneſs of his Body obliged him in a manner to yield at laſt, and communicate with *Urſacius* and *Valens* [s]. *Athanaſius* ſeems to inſinuate in ſome Places, that he ſigned his Condemnation [t]; but in another he expreſly denies it [u]. *Sulpitius Severus* thinks he was guilty of no other Crime but that of communicating with the *Arians* [w]. *Athanaſius* only ſays, that he conſented to communicate with *Urſacius* and *Valens* [x]. However, that he did not ſtop there, but ſigned the *Arian* Confeſſion of *Sirmium*, is but too manifeſt from ſeveral unexceptionable and cotemporary Writers. *Phœbadius* Biſhop of *Agen*, in *France*, in his Anſwer written at this very Time to the *Arians*, bragging, that their Doctrine had been approved and embraced by the great *Oſius*, allows the Fact; but adds, that he was induced thereunto by Force, and not Conviction [y]. *Marcellinus* and *Fauſtinus*, who wrote at the ſame time, ſay, that *Oſius* ſet his Hand, but never yielded his Heart, to the *Arian* Impiety [z]. Nay, *Hilarius* Biſhop of *Poitiers* ſuppoſes the *Sirmian* Confeſſion of Faith to have been drawn up by *Oſius* and *Potamus*; for he often calls it, *the Hereſy, the Blaſphemies, the wild and mad Conceits of* Oſius *and* Potamus [a]. *Vigilius Tapſenſis* ranks *Oſius* with *Urſacius, and the other wicked Men, who compoſed the ſacrilegious Confeſſion of* Sirmium [b]. *Socrates* writes, that he ſigned the *Sirmian* Symbol [c]; *Sozomen*, that he conſented to the Suppreſſion of the Words *Omoouſion*, and *Omoiouſion* [d]; and *Euſebius* of *Vercelli* beſtows high Encomiums on *Gregory* Biſhop of *Elvira*, for oppoſing the great *Tranſgreſſor* Oſius [e]. *Potamus*, whom I have mentioned above, was Biſhop of *Lisbone*, and a moſt ſanguine Stickler for the Orthodox Party; but upon the Emperor's yielding to him ſome Lands of the Imperial Demeſne, that lay very convenient for him, he changed Sides, and became a moſt zealous

Confined and racked.

He yields at laſt.

He ſigns the Sirmian *Confeſſion of Faith.*

[q] Ath. de fug. p. 704. Apol. 2. p. 807. [r] Id. ib. Socr. p. 127. [s] Ath. ad Sol. p. 841. [t] Ath. de fug. p. 704. & apol. 2. p. 807. [u] Id. ad Sol. p. 841. [w] Sulp. l. 2. p. 161, 162. [x] Ath. ad Sol. p. 841. [y] Phœbad. contr. Arian. p. 180. [z] Mar. & Fauſt. p. 34. [a] Hil. de ſyn. p. 124, 125, 133. [b] Vigil. in Eutychian. l. 5. n. 3. [c] Socr. l. 2. c. 31. [d] Soz. l. 4. c. 12. [e] Hil. frag. 2. p. 4.

Champion

Champion of the *Arian* Doctrine [f]; inſomuch that he is ranked by *Phœbadius* with *Urſacius* and *Valens*, the Two great Apoſtles of the *Arians* [g].

The Fall of the great *Oſius*, whom the orthodox Party looked upon as their invincible Hero, ſurpriſed the whole World [h]. Some could not believe it; others aſcribed it to his great Age, which might have weakened his Judgment [i]. It was immediately publiſhed all over the Eaſt, and great Rejoicings were made on the Occaſion, by the Biſhops in thoſe Parts, who looked upon ſuch a Conqueſt as a ſignal Victory over the Orthodox [k]. *Phœbadius* tells us, that the chief Argument alleged by the *Arians*, in favour of their Doctrine, againſt the Biſhops of *Gaul*, was *the Converſion of* Oſius, as they ſtyled it [l]. Here *Davidius* pleaſes himſelf with ridiculing, and indeed very juſtly, this and ſeveral other Converſions, greatly boaſted by the *Arians*; but he muſt give me Leave to put him in mind, that he ridicules, at the ſame time, the many Converſions which his Church is conſtantly boaſting, ſince moſt of them, eſpecially thoſe thus made in the new World, have been owing to Arguments of the ſame nature as that of *Oſius*, and other *Arian* Proſelytes, and were not perhaps at all more ſincere. *Hilarius*, Biſhop of *Poitiers*, who lived at this time in Exile, amidſt the *Arians* in *Phrygia*, ſeems not to be well informed as to the Circumſtances of the Fall of *Oſius*, elſe he had made ſome Allowance for the barbarous and inhuman Treatment the unhappy Prelate met with, and not reflected on him with ſo much Bitterneſs and Severity, ſaying, that it had pleaſed God to prolong his Life till he fell, that the World might know what he had been before he fell [m]. That a Man in the Hundredth Year of his Age ſhould yield to moſt exquiſite and repeated Torments, is not at all to be wondered at; and therefore had *Hilarius* been better informed, he had rather pitied than reproached him. But the *Arians*, among whom he lived, took care to conceal whatever could any ways depreciate their boaſted Victory: at leaſt that *Hilarius* was a Stranger to what *Oſius* had ſuffered, is manifeſt, from his aſcribing the Fall of that great Prelate not to the Cruelty of his Enemies, but to the too great Love he had for his Sepulchre [n], meaning, I ſuppoſe, the Deſire he had of dying in his native Country, and not in Exile.

The Arians *triumph.*

Hilarius *not well informed as to the Circumſtances of his Fall.*

[f] Marcell. & Fauſt. p. 34. [g] Phœbad. p. 169. [h] Id. p. 180. Soz. l. 4. c. 12. [i] Sulp. l. 2. p. 161, 162. [k] Soz. ib. [l] Phœbad. p. 180. [m] Hil. ſyn. p. 133. [n] Idem ib. p. 137.

He is restored to his See.

Osius having thus gratified the Empetor, by communicating with the *Arians*, and signing the *Sirmian* Confession of Faith, he was immediately reinstated in his See, and suffered to return to his native Country, where he gave some Trouble, it seems, to the Orthodox Bishops; for *Gregory*, Bishop of *Elvira*, is highly commended by *Eusebius* of *Vercelli*, who lived then in Exile, *for opposing the Transgressor* Osius, as I have observed above. The unfortunate Prelate did not live long after his Fall, but died in the Latter-end of the same Year 357. according to the most probable Opinion. He did not forget the Crime he had committed, says *Athanasius* [o], but grievously complained, at the Point of Death, of the Violence that had been offered him, anathematized the Heresy of *Arius*, and exhorted, as by his last Will, all Mankind to reject it [p]. To his Repentance *Athanasius*, no doubt, alludes, where he writes, that *Osius* yielded only for a time [q]; which he says of no other, not even of *Liberius*. As for the Account, which some Writers give of his tragical End [r], it is not worthy of Notice. The *Greek* Church honours him as a Saint, and his Festival is kept on the 27th of *August* [s]; but they are certainly mistaken in supposing him to have died in Banishment. The Case of *Osius* deserves, without all Doubt, to be greatly pitied. But it would be still more worthy of our Pity and Compassion, had he been himself an Enemy to all Persecution. But it must be observed, that he was the Author and Promoter of the First Christian Persecution. For it was he who first stirred up *Constantine* against the *Donatists*; many of whom were sent into Exile, and some even sentenced to Death, nay, and led to the Place of Execution. I dare not interpret the very severe Treatment he met with, or his Fall and Apostasy, as a Judgment; but cannot help thinking him, on that Consideration, less worthy of our Compassion and Concern than a Man of his Years and Merit would otherwise have been.

Constantius *appoints a Council to meet at* Nicomedia;

Constantius having thus gained over to the Heterodox Party the celebrated Bishop of *Cordoua*, and sent those into Exile, whom he apprehended most capable of traversing his Design, resolved to assemble a Council, not doubting but he should be able, by some means or other, to prevail upon the Members, that composed it, to approve and embrace the Doctrine, which he was labouring with indefatigable Pains to establish. Accordingly he wrote to the chief Bishops of each

[o] Ath. ad Sol. p. 141. & 842. [p] Idem ib. [q] Idem de frag. p. 704. & apol. 2. p. 807. [r] Vide Isidor. de vir. ill. in Osio, c. 1. [s] Menæa, p. 293.

Province, enjoining them to meet in the Name of the reſt, at an appointed Time, in the City of *Nicomedia* [t]. In Compliance with his Orders the Biſhops immediately ſet out; but, while they were on the Road, they were ſtopped by the News that was brought them of the utter Deſtruction of the City of *Nicomedia* by a ſudden and moſt dreadful Earthquake. This public Calamity happened on the 24th of *Auguſt* 358 [u], and the *Arians*, in the Account which they tranſmitted of it to Court, aſſured the Emperor, that ſeveral Biſhops, who were for *Conſubſtantiality*, had been buried under the Ruins of the great Church [w]. It was probably, by this Account, that *Philoſtorgius* was deceived and miſled, when he wrote that Fifteen Biſhops, who were all Defenders of *Conſubſtantiality*, were cruſhed to Pieces by the Fall of the Church, together with *Cecrops* Biſhop of the City [x]. But *Sozomen* aſſures us, that, when the Church fell, there was not a ſingle Perſon in it, and that Two Biſhops only periſhed in the Earthquake, *viz. Cecrops*, who was an *Arian*, and a Biſhop of *Boſporus* [y]. This Mifortune obliged the Emperor to change the Place of the Council; and accordingly Letters were immediately diſpatched to all the Biſhops, ordering them to repair to *Nice*, which City was ſuggeſted to him by *Baſilius*, the *Semi-Arian* Biſhop of *Ancyra*, with a Deſign, ſays *Theodoret* [z], to eclipſe the Glory and Authority of the Firſt Council by the Confuſion of Two. Be that as it will, the Biſhops were ordered to meet there early in the Summer of the Year 359. Such as were not in a Condition to undertake ſuch a Journey, on Account of their Age or Infirmities, were to ſend Prieſts or Deacons, as their Deputies, to vote and act in their Name; and the Council was ſtrictly enjoined to tranſmit to the Emperor ſuch Decrees as they ſhould enact, that he might examine them, and ſee whether they were agreeable to Scripture: for this Purpoſe Ten Deputies were to be appointed by the Biſhops of the Eaſt, and the like Number by thoſe of the Weſt [a]. But while the World was expecting to ſee a ſecond Oecumenical Council aſſembled at *Nice*, the Emperor all on a ſudden changed his Mind, and inſtead of one, reſolved to convene Two, the one in the Eaſt, and the other in the Weſt [b]. This Change was owing to the Intrigues of the *Anomeans* or *Pure Arians*, who finding the far greater Part of the Biſhops either for the orthodox

which City is deſtroyed by an Earthquake.

The Council appointed to meet at Nice.

Two Councils appointed to meet inſtead of one.

[t] Soz. l. 4. c. 16. & l. 3. c. 19. Ath. de ſyn. p. 873. [u] Greg. Nyſſ. de facto, p. 75. [w] Soz. ib. [x] Philoſt. l. 4. c. 20. [y] Soz. ib. [z] Theodor. l. 1. c. 22. [a] Soz. l. 4. c. 16. Ath. de ſyn. p. 869. [b] Ath. de ſyn. p. 870.

Faith of *Nice*, or the *Semi-Arian*, as eſtabliſhed in a Council at *Antioch*, concluded, that there would be no Means to divert them, when aſſembled together, from condemning their Doctrine; whereas if they were divided, they did not deſpair of being able to manage both Aſſemblies, or at leaſt one of the Two [c]. This Deſign of dividing the Council they privately imparted to the Eunuch *Euſebius*, their great Friend, and the Emperor's chief Favourite, who, highly applauding the Scheme, took upon him to get it approved by *Conſtantius*.

The Occaſion of this Change.

And this he eaſily effected, by repreſenting, that a General Council would put the Biſhops to greater Trouble and Inconveniences than moſt of them could well bear, and, at the ſame time, the Treaſury to an immenſe Charge; for on ſuch Occaſions their Expences were defrayed by the Emperor [d]. He therefore adviſed him to aſſemble Two Councils at the ſame time, one in the Eaſt, and the other in the Weſt, which, he ſaid, would be leſs troubleſome to the Biſhops, and leſs expenſive to the Exchequer. To theſe Reaſons *Conſtantius* acquieſced; but, as he was a zealous *Semi-Arian*, *Euſebius* kept him in the Dark, as to the true Motive of ſuch a Change. Thus was *Conſtantius*, and thus have many Princes been, ſince his Time, led, as it were hoodwinked, by ſome in whom they repoſed an intire Confidence, into Meaſures tending to promote Deſigns quite oppoſite to their own.

Rimini *choſen for the Weſtern Biſhops.*

This Point being ſettled, to the great Satisfaction of the *Anomeans*, *Ariminum*, now *Rimini*, on the *Adriatic* Sea, was thought the moſt proper Place for the Weſtern Biſhops to meet at. But the City of *Nice*, where the General Council was to aſſemble, having ſuffered much by the late Earthquake, the Emperor deſired the Eaſtern Biſhops might not meet there, but in whatever other Place they ſhould agree among themſelves to be the moſt proper and convenient [e]. This *Theodoret* aſcribes to a particular Providence, that would not ſuffer the great Council of *Nice* to be ever confounded with a Conventicle of Heretics [f]. As the Biſhops could not agree about the Place, and it was not at all probable they ſhould, the Emperor, by the Advice of a few, who were then with him at *Sirmium*, named the City of *Seleucia* in *Iſauria* [g]. And now that the Place was ſettled for both Councils, *Conſtantius* iſſued an Order, enjoining not only the chief Biſhops of each Province, as he had done the Year before, but all,

and Seleucia *in* Iſauria *for thoſe of the Eaſt.*

[c] Ath. de ſyn. p. 873, 874. Soz. l. 4. c. 16. [d] Idem ib. & c. 17. [e] Soz. l. 4. c. 24. [f] Theod. l. 2. c. 21. [g] Socr. l. 2. c. 39. Soz. l. 4. c. 16.

without

without Exception, to repair to one of the Two [h]; nay, he diſpatched Officers into the Provinces, with a ſtrict Charge to ſee this Order punctually obeyed, and put in Execution [i]. The Biſhops therefore ſet out from all Parts; the public Carriages, Roads, and Houſes, were every-where crouded with them; which gave great Offence to the Catechumens, and no ſmall Diverſion to the Pagans, who thought it equally ſtrange and ridiculous, that Men, who had been brought up from their Infancy in the Chriſtian Religion, and whoſe Buſineſs it was to inſtruct others in that Belief, ſhould be conſtantly hurrying, in their old Age, from one Place to another, to know what they themſelves ſhould believe [k]. *Ammianus Marcellinus* complains, that the neceſſary Funds for the Maintenance of the public Carriages were quite drained and exhauſted, by the roaming about of the Chriſtian Biſhops [l]. Their Charges were defrayed by the Emperor, as I have obſerved above; but the Biſhops of *Gaul* and *Britain*, that they might be the more independent, inſiſted upon traveling at their own Expence; only Three of the latter, not having wherewithal to ſupport themſelves, choſe rather to be obliged to the Emperor than burdenſome to their Collegues, who generouſly offered to contribute to their Maintenance, every one according to his Ability [m].

The Weſtern Biſhops, that is, thoſe of *Illyricum*, *Italy*, *Africa*, *Spain*, *Gaul*, and *Britain*, being aſſembled at *Rimini*, in all 400 and upwards [o], the Emperor wrote to *Taurus*, the *Præfectus Prætorio* of *Italy*, charging him to be preſent at all the Debates, and not to ſuffer the Biſhops to ſeparate, till, in Points of Faith, they had all agreed: if he ſucceeded therein he was to be rewarded with the Conſular Dignity [p]. At the ſame time he wrote to the Biſhops, injoining them to treat only of ſuch Matters as related to the Faith, Unity, and Order of the Church, and forbidding them to meddle, on any Pretence whatſoever, with what concerned the Eaſtern Biſhops, who, he ſaid, would take care to ſettle their own Affairs, ſince they were met for that Purpoſe [q]. This was to prevent their entering upon the Cauſe of *Athanaſius*, whom he well knew the Weſtern Biſhops would have declared innocent. The Emperor's Letter is dated the 27th of *May* 359 [r]. At this Council *Reſtitutus*, Bi-

The Emperor's Letter to the Weſtern Biſhops.

[h] Hil. de ſyn. p. 24. [i] Sulp. l. 2. p. 164. [k] Ath. de ſyn. p. 870. [l] Ammian l. 21. p. 203. [m] Sulp. l. 4. c. 17. [o] Ath. de ſyn. p. 874. Sulp. l. 2. p. 162. Soz. p. 563. [p] Hier. p. 143. Sulp. p. 162. [q] Hil. frag. 2. p. 43, 44. [r] Idem ib. p. 46.

ſhop

ſhop of *Carthage*, is ſuppoſed to have preſided, as he was, both for Piety and Learning, the moſt conſpicuous in the Aſſembly. At their firſt Meeting, the Two *Arian* Biſhops, *Urſacius* and *Valens*, appeared with a Paper in their Hands, containing a new Confeſſion of Faith, compoſed lately at *Sirmium* by the Emperor, by a ſmall Number of *Arian* and *Semi-Arian* Biſhops, and ſeveral Presbyters and Deacons, who, after a Debate, which laſted the whole Day, had at length agreed to ſuppreſs the Word *Conſubſtantial*, and introduce the Word *like* in its room; ſo that the Son was no more to be ſaid *conſubſtantial*, but *like to the Father in all things*; the Three laſt Words *Conſtantius* added, and, by obliging all who were preſent to ſign them, defeated, ſay the *Semi-Arians*, the wicked Deſigns of the Heretics, meaning the *Pure Arians* [s]. However, excepting thoſe Words, the whole Confeſſion was thought to favour their Doctrine [t]; whence the *Semi-Arians* held out till Night, when the Emperor, well ſatisfied with the Words, *like in all things*, obliged them to ſign it. This Confeſſion of Faith was drawn up, and ſigned, on the Eve of *Pentecoſt* [u], that is, on the 22d or 23d of *May* 359 [w]. *Eaſter* having fallen that Year on the 4th of *April* [x] (A). *Urſacius* and *Valens* read

The Arians *propoſe a new Confeſſion, drawn up at* Sirmium.

[s] Ath. de ſyn. p. 876. Hil. frag. 1. p. 44. Epiph. hæreſ. 73. c. 22. [t] Hil. & Epiph. ib. [u] Idem ib. [w] Ath. de ſyn. p. 875. [x] Buch. cycl.

(A) It was ſigned by the few Biſhops, who were preſent, and by a good Number of Presbyters and Deacons. The Biſhops were *Marcus* of *Arethuſa*, *George*, who had been intruded into the See of *Alexandria*, *Baſilius* of *Ancyra*, *Germinius* of *Sirmium*, *Hypatianus* of *Heraclea*, *Valens*, *Urſacius*, and *Pancratius* of *Peluſium* (1). *Valens*, in ſigning it, added to his Name theſe Words; *I believe the Son to be like to the Father*. He was unwilling to acknowlege the Son like to the Father *in all things*, agreeably to the Confeſſion, which he was to ſign, and therefore ſuppreſſed theſe Words. But the Emperor inſiſting upon his adding them, he took his Will for the Rule of his Faith, and added them accordingly. *Baſilius* of *Ancyra*, ſuſpecting ſome Meaning contrary to the Doctrine which he held, to lie concealed and diſguiſed under thoſe Words, declared, that he underſtood by them a Likeneſs in *Subſtance*, in *Exiſtence*, and in *Eſſence*; and that he ſigned in this, and no other Senſe, the preſent Symbol. Not ſatisfied with this Declaration, he wrote, ſome time after, an Expoſition of the Faith that was profeſſed by him, and the other *Semi-Arian* Biſhops. This Expoſition is, by *Epiphanius*, ſtyled a Letter, and was placed by him after the circular Letter of the Council of *Ancyra*. The preſent Confeſſion of *Sirmium* is commonly ſtyled the Third, but was, properly ſpeaking, the Fourth: For before this, Three different Symbols had been compoſed at *Sirmium*; *viz.* one intirely Orthodox, in 351. another altogether *Arian*, in 357. a Third *Semi-Arian*, in 358. and the preſent in 359. The Second *Liberius* ſigned at *Berœa*, and the Third at *Sirmium*, upon his Arrival in that City.

(1) Athan. de ſyn. p. 873. Epi. 73. c. 22. Socr. l. 2. c. 29.

it

it to the Council, adding, when they had done, that it had been approved of by the Emperor, and therefore that they ought all to be satisfied with it, without recurring to any other Councils or Creeds, without demanding any other Confeſſion of the Heretics, or enquiring too narrowly into their Doctrine and Opinions, which would be attended with much Trouble, endleſs Diſputes, and eternal Diviſions; that the Catholic Truths, which all Men were bound to believe, ought not to be darkened with Metaphyſical Terms, but expreſſed by Words, which all Men underſtood; and, laſtly, that it was quite idle to quarrel and make ſo much Noiſe about a Word (meaning the Word *conſubſtantial*) which none of the inſpired Writers had thought fit to make uſe of in explaining the Myſteries of our holy Religion [y]. What Anſwer the Council returned I can find no-where recorded. But a Motion being made ſoon after to condemn and anathematize the *Arian* and all other Hereſies, *Urſacius* and his Party oppoſed it; which alarmed the Orthodox Biſhops, concluding from thence, that whatever Expreſſions they made uſe of, their Belief was different from that of the Catholic Church. They therefore reſolved to hearken to them no longer; and accordingly, without the leaſt Regard to their Remonſtrances and Proteſtations, they condemned, with one Conſent, all Hereſies in general, and that of *Arius* in particular; declared heretical the Confeſſion of Faith preſented by *Urſacius* and *Valens*; confirmed that of *Nice*, and ordered the Word *conſubſtantial* to be retained, ſince the true Meaning of it might be ſufficiently gathered from ſeveral Paſſages in Scripture [z]. They did not ſtop here, but, tranſported with Zeal on the *Arians* attempting to impoſe upon them by a Second Confeſſion of Faith, they declared them all, and their Leaders *Urſacius*, *Valens*, *Germinius*, and *Caius*, by Name, ignorant and deceitful Men, Impoſtors, Heretics, depoſed them in the Council, and ſigned all to a Man this Declaration on the 21ſt of *July* of the preſent Year 359 [a].

which is rejected,

and they condemned and depoſed.

With this Act they put an End to the Seſſions, and immediately diſpatched Ten Deputies to acquaint the Emperor with what had paſſed, purſuant to his expreſs Command. The like Number was ſent by the *Arians*, who had aſſiſted at the Council. Theſe, traveling with great Expedition, arrived at *Conſtantinople*, where the Court then was, ſome time before the others, and being immediately admitted to the

Deputies ſent by the Council to the Emperor,

[y] Ath. Soz. ib. Theod. l. 1. c. 15. [z] Ath. ib. p. 876. Soz. ib. Hil. frag. 2. p. 47, 48. [a] Ath. ib. Socr. l. 1. c. 37. Hil. frag. 2. p. 46.

Emperor,

Emperor, they prejudiced him to ſuch a Degree againſt the orthodox Party, that he would not ſo much as ſee their Deputies, pretending to be wholly taken up with the Affairs of the State. They were therefore obliged to deliver the Letter, which the Council had wrote on this Occaſion to one of his Miniſters [b]. They expected every Day to be admitted to an Audience, or, at leaſt, to receive an Anſwer, and be diſmiſſed. But, after they had been thus kept for ſome time in Expectation, the Emperor all on a ſudden left *Conſtantinople*, in order to head his Army againſt the *Barbarians*, who had broken into the Empire. He was no ſooner gone than one of the Miniſters came to acquaint them, that it was the Emperor's Pleaſure they ſhould repair forthwith to *Adrianople*, and there wait his Return [c]. However, before he ſet out, he wrote to the Council, giving them notice of his ſudden Departure from *Conſtantinople*; and alleging, by way of Excuſe, for not having ſeen or heard their Deputies, the preſent Situation of public Affairs, which had engroſſed his whole Attention; whereas, the diſcuſſing and ſettling of ſpiritual Affairs required a Mind quite free and diſengaged from all worldly Cares. He concluded his ſhort Letter with intreating them not to think of ſeparating till he was at Leiſure to ſettle, in Conjunction with them, Matters of ſo great Importance to the Church, and the whole Chriſtian World [d]. The Deſign of the moſt wicked *Conſtantius*, as *Athanaſius* ſtyles him [e], was to tire out the Biſhops with ſuch Delays, hoping they would, in the End, chuſe rather to ſign the laſt *Sirmian* Confeſſion, which he was bent upon eſtabliſhing in the room of the *Nicene*, than to be long kept, as it were, in Exile, at a Diſtance from their Sees [f]. But this he could not compaſs for the preſent, the Biſhops declaring, in their Anſwer to his Letter, that they could not, and hoped that they never ſhould, upon any Conſideration whatſoever, depart from what they had ſo unanimouſly ſettled and decreed [g]. *Socrates* writes, that the Biſhops, after having waited ſome time in vain for the Emperor's Anſwer to their Letter, left *Rimini*, and retired to their reſpective Sees [h]. And here he ends his Account of that Council. It were greatly to be wiſhed, that nothing elſe could be ſaid of it; but ſeveral cotemporary and unexceptionable Writers, and *Hilarius* among the reſt [i], aſſure us, that *Conſtantius*

who leaves Conſtantinople *without ſeeing them.*

He endeavours to tire their Patience with Delays.

[b] Sulp. l. 2. c. 163. Ath. ad Afr. p. 934. Hil. frag. 2. p. 36. [c] Socr. ib. Ath. de ſyn. p. 930. [d] Ath. de ſyn. p. 929, 930. [e] Id. ib. [f] Theod. l. 2. c. 15, 16. [g] Id. ib. [h] Soc. l. 2. c. 37. [i] Hil. in conſ. l. 1. p. 113.

changed

changed at last the Faith of the Western Bishops into Impiety. Of this deplorable Change they give us the following Account.

Their Deputies ordered to Nice *in* Thrace;

The *Arians*, taking Occasion from the last Letter of the Bishops at *Rimini* to incense *Constantius* against them, prevailed upon him to order their Deputies to a City in *Thrace*, known at that Time by the Name of *Nice*, but formerly called *Ostudizus*, and placed by *Sanson* a few Leagues to the East of *Adrianople*. This Place they chose, that the Symbol, which they designed to impose upon them, might be confounded by the ignorant People with that of the great Council of *Nice* in *Bithynia* [k]. The Deputies no sooner arrived there, than a Confession of Faith was proposed to them intirely agreeable to the last made at *Sirmium*, except that in this new Creed the Son was declared *like to the Father*, without the Addition of the Words *in all Things*. This they rejected at first with great Resolution and Intrepidity; but the *Arians* were no less resolute, and therefore left nothing unattempted they could think of to carry their Point [l]. But finding Hope and Fear, Threats and Promises, equally ineffectual, they proceeded at last to open Force and Violence [m]. What Kind of Violence was employed against them, the Author does not tell us; but *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus* ascribe their retracting what they had declared to be holy, and approving what they had condemned as impious, to the Love of their Sees, and the Dread they were in of being driven from them [n]. Be that as it will, it is certain that they yielded at last; that they accepted and signed, without the least Limitation or Restriction, the above-mentioned Confession of Faith; consented to the Suppression of the Word *Consubstantial*; declared void and null all the Acts and Proceedings of the Council of *Rimini*; anathematized, as heretical, all Opinions contrary to the Doctrine contained in the said Confession; and, finally, admitted to their Communion *Ursacius*, *Valens*, *Germinius*, and *Caius*, whom they had not long before deposed as Heretics [o]. *Restitutus*, Bishop of *Carthage*, and one of the most eminent Prelates at that Time in the Church, signed the first, and the other Deputies after him, according to the Dignity of their Sees. The Emperor, transported with Joy at the News of their Compliance, which he looked upon as a signal Victory, gave them immediately Leave to return to *Rimini*. At the same time he wrote to *Taurus*, charging him anew not to suffer the Bishops to depart till

where they sign the Sirmian *Confession.*

[k] Theod. l. 2. c. 16. Hil. in ann. p. 122. [l] Id. ib.. [m] Hil. frag. 2. p. 23.
[n] Marc. & Faust. p. 25. [o] Hil. frag. 2. p. 36, 37. Theod. ib. Sulp. l. 2. p. 165.

they had all ſigned the ſame Confeſſion of Faith, and impowering him to ſend into Exile ſuch as by their Obſtinacy ſhould diſtinguiſh themſelves above the reſt, provided they were not above Fifteen in Number) [p]. He likewiſe wrote to the Biſhops, commanding them, on pain of incurring his Indignation, to ſuppreſs for ever the Words *Subſtance* and *conſubſtantial*, ſeverely reprimanding them for preſuming to depoſe *Urſacius* and his Collegues, and aſſuring them, that they ſhould not be allowed to return to their Sees, till they had intitled themſelves to his Favour by an intire and unreſerved Compliance with his Will [q]. To this Letter the *Arians*, who had aſſiſted at the Council, to the Number of Eighty, returned a moſt ſubmiſſive Anſwer, and even thanked the Emperor for the great Pains he took to eſtabliſh the true Doctrine [r]. However, *Taurus* declared that he could by no means ſuffer them to depart till the reſt had agreed with them, and the whole Aſſembly was of one Mind. The orthodox Biſhops ſhewed at firſt ſome Reſolution, and even refuſed to communicate with their own Deputies. But this Reſolution ſoon vaniſhed; they were eager to return to their Sees; the Emperor was inflexible; *Taurus* took care to render the Place both inconvenient and diſagreeable to them. Some therefore fell off, others followed their Example, the reſt began to waver, and, being ſo far got the better of, yielded ſoon after, and went over to the *Arian* Party in ſuch Crouds, that in a very ſhort time the Number of the orthodox Biſhops, who continued ſteady, was reduced to 20 [s]. At the Head of theſe was *Phœbadius*, the celebrated Biſhop of *Agen*, who ſeemed invincible; but nevertheleſs was overcome in the End, not by the Menaces of the Emperor, or his Prefect, but by the Craft and Subtilty of *Urſacius* and *Valens*, who, finding they could by no other Means prevail upon him to accept the *Sirmian* Confeſſion, declared, that, to put an End to the unhappy Diviſions that had ſo long rent the Church, they had at laſt reſolved to agree to ſuch Alterations and Additions as ſhould be judged proper and neceſſary by him and his Collegues. This Declaration was received by all with great Joy: *Phœbadius* triumphed, thinking he had carried his Point, and ſaved the Reputation of the Council. To the Symbol were immediately added ſeveral Anathema's againſt the *Arian* Hereſy, and an Article declaring *the Son equal to the Father, without Begin-*

Conſtantius orders the Biſhops at Rimini *to ſuppreſs the Words* Subſtance *and* Conſubſtantial.

The greater Part yield.

The others impoſed upon by the Arians.

[p] Athan. ad Afr. p. 941. Sulp. p. 165. Marc. & Fauſt. p. 26. Hil. frag. p. 37.
[q] Ath. ib. p. 934. [r] Hil. frag. 2. p. 37, 38. [s] Sulp. p. 166.

ning, and before all Time. When this Article was read, *Valens* desired, that, in order to leave no room for new Disputes or Chicanery, they would add, that *the Son was not a Creature like other Creatures* [t]. This was evidently supposing the Son to be a Creature only exalted above all other Creatures; so that by admitting such an Article they condemned the Doctrine which they designed to establish, and established that which they designed to condemn. And yet of this neither was *Phœbadius* aware, nor any of his Party, as they afterwards solemnly declared [u]. A most unaccountable Oversight, and hardly credible! But *Theodoret* [w], *Ambrose* [x], *Sulpitius Severus* [y], and *Fulgentius* [z], took it upon their Word, and so must we. Neither Party could brag of the Victory; for the *Arians* had anathematized the Heresy of *Arius*; and on the other hand the orthodox Bishops had deliberately agreed to the suppressing of the Words *Substance* and *Consubstantial*, and inadvertently acknowleged the Son to be a Creature; which was all the *Arians* aimed at, or could desire. The Council being thus ended, new Deputies were sent to acquaint the Emperor with what had passed, who being highly pleased with the Report made by *Ursacius* and *Valens* (for they were at the Head of the Deputation) immediately granted the Bishops Leave to return to their respective Sees, after they had been about Four Months at *Rimini*.

The Council no sooner broke up than the *Arians* began to proclaim aloud the Victory they had gained, bragging, that it had not been defined in the Council of *Rimini*, that the Son was not a Creature, but only that he was not like other Creatures; and declaring it was, and had always been, their Opinion, that the Son was no more like the Father, than a Piece of Glass was like an Emerald [a]. *Phœbadius*, and the other Bishops who had adhered to him, were returned to their Sees with great Joy, flattering themselves that they had sufficiently established the Catholic Doctrine, and prevented all future Disputes: but, finding that the *Arians* pretended their Tenets had been confirmed by this very Council, and seriously reflecting on the Articles, which they themselves had agreed to, they discovered at last how grosly they had been imposed upon, and publicly retracted all they had said, done, o signed, repugnant to the Truths of the Catholic Church [b]. However, *Gregory* Bishop of *Elvira* refused to communicate with any of the

They discover their Mistake.

[t] Sulp. ib. [u] Theod. l. 1. c. 17. [w] Id. ib. [x] Ambros. de fid. l. 3. c. 7. [y] Sulp. l. 2. p. 166. [z] Fulg. in Pint. c. 3. p. 536. [a] Hil. frag. 1. p. 53, 54. [b] Hier. in Lucif. c. 7.

Are judged guilty by the exiled Bishops.

Bishops who had assisted at the Council of *Rimini*, and was on that account commended by *Eusebius* of *Vercelli* [c]. The exiled Bishops, and those, who lay concealed, agreed among themselves by Letters, to declare them for ever incapable of performing any Episcopal or Sacerdotal Functions, and to admit them to the Communion of the Church only in the Capacity of Laymen [d]. When Peace was restored to the Church by the Death of *Constantius* in 361. most of the orthodox Bishops were for deposing all those of the Council of *Rimini*, and placing others in their room. But this Sentence the People would not suffer to be put in Execution, rising every-where in Defence of their Pastors, and in some Places insulting, beating, and even killing, those who came to depose them [e].

Great Disagreement in the Council of Seleucia.

As for the Council of *Seleucia*, it met on the 27th of *September* 359. and consisted only of One hundred and Sixty Bishops, all *Arians*, or *Semi-Arians*, except Twelve or Thirteen orthodox Bishops from *Egypt* [f]. This Assembly *Gregory Nazianzen* calls the *Tower* of *Calane*, or *Babel*, the Council of *Caiaphas* [g]. And indeed with a great deal of Reason; for nothing was there seen but Tumult, Confusion, and Disorder. The *Anomeans* and *Semi-Arians* appeared so irreconcilably incensed against each other, and carried on their Debates with so much Animosity and Bitterness, that the Quæstor *Leonas*, whom the Emperor had appointed to assist at the Council, thinking it impossible they should ever agree in any one Point, rose up at their Fourth Meeting, while they were in the Heat of the Dispute, and, withdrawing abruptly, put an End to that Session, nay, and to the Council; for, being invited the next Day, the First of *October*, to the Assembly, he refused to go, saying, that he did not conceive his Presence to be at all necessary, since they might quarrel and scold as much as they pleased without him [h]. This he did, says *Sozomen*, to favour the *Anomeans*, who thence took Occasion to absent themselves from the Council, which, as it was chiefly composed of *Semi-Arians*, seemed determined to condemn their Doctrine [i]. However, the *Semiarians* met by themselves; and, finding they could by no means prevail upon the *Anomeans* to return to the Council, they condemned their Doctrine as heretical and blasphemous, excommunicated and deposed the leading Men of their Party, appointed others in their room,

The Semi-Arians *condemn and depose the* Arians.

[c] Hil. frag. 2. p. 455. [d] Mar. & Faust. p. 47. [e] Hier. ib. [f] Ath. de syn. p. 881. Hil. in conf. l. 1. p. 114. [g] Greg. Naz. or. 21. p. 386. [h] Soor. l. 2. c. 40. [i] Soz. l. 4. c. 22.

and

and gave notice thereof to their reſpective Churches [k]. Before they broke up, they diſpatched Ten Deputies to acquaint the Emperor with the Tranſactions of the Council. But the Biſhops, whom they had depoſed, arriving at Court before them, and being by their Friends there immediately introduced to *Conſtantius*, they prejudiced him againſt the Council of *Seleucia* to ſuch a Degree, that it was ſome Time before he could prevail upon himſelf to hear the Deputies. However, he heard them at laſt, and, by threatening them with Exile if they did not comply, obliged them to ſign the laſt Confeſſion of *Sirmium*, which had been rejected by the Council as *Arian* [l]. In this he ſpent the whole Day, and great part of the Night, preceding the Firſt of *January*, though he was obliged to make the neceſſary Preparations for entering on that Day his Tenth Conſulate with the uſual Pomp and Solemnity [m].

They ſign the laſt Confeſſion of Sirmium.

In the Beginning of the Year 360. the *Anomeans* aſſembling by themſelves at *Conſtantinople*, as the *Semi-Arians* had done at *Seleucia*, in order to ingratiate themſelves with the Emperor, not only received the laſt *Sirmian* Confeſſion, but condemned all other Confeſſions or Symbols that had been made till then, or ſhould be made for the future. They then declared all the Acts of the Council of *Seleucia* void and null; and, to be even with the *Semi-Arians*, depoſed, under various Pretences, ſuch of their Party as had moſt contributed to the depoſing of them, and even prevailed upon the Emperor to ſend them into Exile [n].

The Arians, *in their Turn, condemn and depoſe the* Semi-arians; *and alſo ſign the laſt Confeſſion of* Sirmium.

They did not ſtop here, but obtained of *Conſtantius* an Order, which was publiſhed throughout the Empire, commanding all Biſhops to ſign the *Sirmian* Confeſſion, on pain of forfeiting their Dignity, and being ſent into Exile [o] (A). This Order was executed with the utmoſt

An Order from the Emperor injoining all Biſhops to ſign the Sirmian *Confeſſion.*

[k] Id. ib. Socr. l. 1. c. 40. Ath. de ſyn. p. 881. Baſil. in Eunom. l. 1. p. 697. Sulp. l. 1. p. 165. [l] Hil. in conf. l. 1. p. 115. Soz. l. 4. c. 23. Baſil. ep. 74. [m] Soz. l. 4. c. 24. [n] Socr. l. 2. c. 12. Soz. l. 4. c. 24. Philoſt. l. 5. c. 1. [o] Soz. l. 4. c. 26.

(A) This Confeſſion is called ſometimes the *Confeſſion of* Nice *in* Thrace, and ſometimes the *Confeſſion of* Rimini; but it differed from both. By the Confeſſion of *Nice*, the Son was acknowleged to be like to the Father, without the Addition of the Words *in all things*, which were an eſſential Part of the laſt Confeſſion of *Sirmium*. In that of *Rimini* the Son was ſaid *not to be a Creature like other Creatures*, and there were no ſuch Words in the Confeſſion of *Sirmium*. But by all Three the Word *Conſubſtantial* was rejected, and no other would ſatisfy the Orthodox, acknowleging the Son to be *of the ſame Subſtance with the Father*. Both the *Arians* and *Semi-arians* allowed the Son to be like to the Father: but that Likeneſs was by them very differently

most Rigour in all the Provinces of the Empire, and very few were found, who did not sign with their Hands what they condemned in their Hearts [p]. Many, who till then had been thought invincible, were overcome, and complied with the Times; and such as did not, were driven, without Distinction, from their Sees, into Exile, and others appointed in their room, the signing of that Confession being a Qualification indispensably requisite both for obtaining and keeping the Episcopal Dignity [q]. Thus were all the Sees throughout the Empire filled with *Arians*, insomuch that in the whole East not one orthodox Bishop was left, and in the West but One, *viz.* *Gregory* Bishop of *Elvira* in *Andalusia*, and he, in all Likelihood, obliged to absent himself from his Flock, and lie concealed, as were probably Pope *Liberius*, and *Vincentius* of *Capua*, if what *Theodoret* relates of them be true, *viz.* that they never consented to the Decrees of *Rimini* [r], and thereby retrieved the Reputation they had lost, the former, by signing the *Sirmian* Confession of the Year 357. and the other by communicating with the *Arians* in 353. as I have related above. But what *Theodoret* writes may be justly called in question; for it is not at all probable, that the Emperor, and the *Arian* Party, so warmly bent on establishing that Confession throughout the Empire, would have suffered the Bishop of the Imperial City of the first See to reject it, without deposing him, as they had done the Bishops of all the other great Sees, and appointing another more compliant in his room. This could not be prevented by his concealing himself in the Caverns and Cœmeteries about *Rome*, as he is said to have done in his Acts quoted by *Baronius* [s], though he might by that means have escaped being sent into Exile. Besides, had he, instead of complying with the Emperor's express Command, withdrawn and absconded, I cannot think that his Antagonist *Felix*, who was still alive, and had done nothing we know of to disoblige the Emperor, and the *Arian* Party,

It was probably signed by Liberius.

[p] Greg. Naz. orat. 21. p. 387. [q] Id. ib. [r] Theod. l. 2. c. 17. [s] Bar. ad ann. 359. n. 48.

differently understood and interpreted. The *Arians* held him to be *like* rather by Grace than by Nature, and as like as a Creature could be to the Creator (1). The *Semi-Arians* confessed him to be like in *Nature*, in *Existence*, in *Essence*, in *Substance*, and in *every thing else*. But the Orthodox maintained him to be of the *same Substance* with the Father, and consequently of the *same Existence*, *Essence*, *&c.* and to express this *Sameness* or *Identity*, they chose the Word *Consubstantial*.

(1) Ruff. l. 1. c. 25.

MVSEVM BRITAN NICVM

by

by whom he had been formerly raiſed to that See, would have neglected ſo favourable an Opportunity of recovering his antient Dignity. If what *Theodoret* ſays be true, *Gregory Nazianzen* is highly to blame for not excepting *Liberius*, when he wrote, that the Biſhops either all complied, or were driven into Exile, excepting a few, who were too inſignificant to be taken notice of by the Emperor, or his Miniſters [u]. Be that as it will, it is certain, that, at this time, the *Arian* Doctrine univerſally obtained; that the Face of the Church appeared quite deformed and disfigured [w]; that the whole World ſaw itſelf, with Aſtoniſhment, all on a ſudden become *Arian* [x]; that the Boat of St. *Peter*, to uſe St. *Jerom*'s Expreſſion, toſſed by furious Winds, by violent Storms, was upon the Point of ſinking, and no Hopes of Safety ſeemed to be left [y].

Arianiſm *univerſally obtains.*

The following Year 361. the *Anomeans*, not fully ſatisfied with the Confeſſion of Faith, which, at their Suggeſtion, the Emperor had taken ſo much Pains to eſtabliſh throughout the Empire, aſſembled, with his Leave, at *Antioch*, and there drew up a new Symbol, or Creed, wherein it was expreſly ſaid, that *the Son was in every thing unlike to the Father*, and that *He was made out of nothing*. *Conſtantius* had formerly expreſſed the greateſt Abhorrence to this Doctrine, and had even baniſhed thoſe who held, and refuſed to anathematize, ſuch *impious Blaſphemies*, as he then ſtyled them [z]. But, having lately changed his Opinion, which was chiefly owing to the great Influence the Eunuch *Euſebius* had over him, he was now no leſs ſanguine for the *Unlikeneſs* of the Son to the Father, than he had been hitherto for the *Likeneſs* [a]. In order therefore to aboliſh the antient, and eſtabliſh this new Creed in its room, he appointed a Council to meet at *Nice* in *Bithynia* [b], which, without all Doubt, he would have treated in the ſame manner as he had done that of *Rimini*. But, as the Biſhops were preparing to ſet out for the appointed Place, they were ſtopped by the ſudden and unexpected News of the Emperor's Death, which put an End to all his Councils, and was heard with equal Joy by thoſe of the *Orthodox* and *Semi-Arian* Party. He was ſucceeded by *Julian*, ſurnamed the *Apoſtate*, who immediately recalled all thoſe who had been baniſhed by *Conſtantius*, on account of their Religion [c]. Whatever was his Motive, the

Conſtantius *deſigns to eſtabliſh the Doctrine of the* Pure Arians;

but is prevented by Death.

[u] Greg. Naz. orat. 1. p. 387. & in chron. [w] Ruf. l. 1. c. 21. [x] Hier. in Lucifer. p. 143. [y] Idem ib. [z] Theod. l. 2. c. 23. [a] Socr. l. 2. c. 45. Ath. de ſyn. p. 906. [b] Philoſt. l. 6. c. 5. [c] Socr. l. 3. c. 1.

Church

The exiled Biſhops recalled by Julian.

Church reaped great Advantages from the Return of ſo many eminent Prelates, who, in the worſt of Times, had, with an invincible Firmneſs and Conſtancy, ſtood up in her Defence. Among the reſt returned, on this Occaſion, the famous *Meletius* Biſhop of *Antioch*, *Euſebius* of *Vercelli*, *Lucifer* of *Cagliari*, who had been all Three confined to the moſt diſtant Parts of *Thebais* in *Egypt*, *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, *Pelagius* of *Laodicea* in *Phœnicia*, and, to the inexpreſſible Joy of the Orthodox Party, their great Champion *Athanaſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* [e], who immediately reſumed, undiſturbed, his Epiſcopal Functions; *George*, the Uſurper of his See, having been aſſaſſinated a little while before by the Pagans of *Alexandria*, on Account of his Avarice and Cruelty [f]. In other Places the orthodox Biſhops, finding the *Arians* in Poſſeſſion of their Sees, contented themſelves with being acknowleged by thoſe of their Communion, without attempting to drive out their Antagoniſts, which would have created great Confuſion, and endleſs Diſturbances, in the Church. *Julian* refuſed to interpoſe his Authority in favour of either Party, ſaying, that as he was not ſo well acquainted with the Nature of their Diſputes as a juſt and impartial Judge ought to be, he hoped they would excuſe him, leſt he ſhould be guilty of ſome Injuſtice, and ſettle Matters of ſuch Importance among themſelves. *Athanaſius* entered *Alexandria* in a kind of Triumph, which is deſcribed in a lively manner by *Gregory Nazianzen*, who ſeems to have pleaſed himſelf with diſplaying, in that Deſcription, all the Eloquence he was Maſter of [g].

The Council of Alexandria.

The Biſhop of *Alexandria* being thus reinſtated, and again at full Liberty to exert his Zeal for the Catholic Cauſe, his firſt Care was to retrieve his fallen Brethren, and reunite them to the Church. With this View he aſſembled, in 362. a Council at *Alexandria*, compoſed only of Confeſſors, that is, of ſuch Biſhops as had choſen rather to forfeit their Dignities and Sees, than receive or ſign the *Arian* Confeſſion of *Rimini* or *Sirmium*. This was one of the moſt reſpectable Councils that was ever held in the Church, not ſo much in regard of the Numbers (for I find not above Twenty named) as of the Merit, Virtue, and Sanctity of the Members that compoſed it. The chief Subject of their Debates, or rather Inquiries, was to find out the moſt proper Means of reſtoring Tranquillity to the Church, after ſo

[e] Theod. l. 3. c. 2. Hier. in Lucif. c. 7. [f] Ammian. l. 22. p. 223. Soz. l. 4. c. 30. Philoſt. l. 7. c. 2. Epiph. p. 912. [g] Greg. Naz. 21.

dreadful

dreadful a Storm. Some, and among the reſt *Lucifer* Biſhop of *Cagliari*, who did not aſſiſt in Perſon, but by his Deputies, the Two Deacons *Herennius* and *Agapetus*, were for depoſing all thoſe who had ſigned the Confeſſion of *Rimini*, and cutting them off from the Communion of the Church. But this unſeaſonable Severity was condemned by the far greater Part, as tending to raiſe a new Storm, and involve the Church in greater Troubles than ever, which the Emperor *Julian* would take care to improve, to the total Ruin of the Chriſtian Religion. *Athanaſius* therefore was for uſing Severity only with the Authors, and chief Promoters, of the late general Defection: and his Opinion prevailed; for a Decree was enacted, importing, that the Authors of the late general Prevarication ſhould, even upon their Repentance, be received to the Communion of the Church only in the Capacity of Laymen, but that the reſt ſhould be all kept in, or reſtored to, their Sees, upon their publicly renouncing the *Arian* Communion, and embracing the Faith of *Nice* [h]. This Decree was every-where received with the greateſt Joy, the Biſhop of *Cagliari* being the only Man, either in the Eaſt or Weſt, who oppoſed it, and that with ſo much Obſtinacy, that, rather than yield, he choſe to ſeparate himſelf from the Communion of the reſt, and to form a new Schiſm, which bore his Name, and ſoon gained a conſiderable Footing, eſpecially in the Weſt; ſeveral Perſons no leſs diſtinguiſhed for Piety than Learning, and among the reſt *Gregory*, the famous Biſhop of *Elvira*, having adopted the Sentiments of a Man, who had ſuffered ſo much for the Purity of the Faith. As *Lucifer* is honoured by the Church of *Rome* as a Saint, and his Feſtival is kept on the 20th of *May* [i], *Baronius* pretends, that he abandoned his Schiſm, and returned to the Communion of the Church, before his Death [k]. But his Cotemporary *Ruffinus*, who probably knew him, aſſures us, that he died in the Schiſm, which he had formed [l]. *Jerom* often ſpeaks of his Schiſm, but no-where gives us the leaſt Hint of his having ever quitted it; which would have afforded him a ſtrong Argument againſt the *Luciferians*, and he would not have failed to urge it, in the Book which he wrote to convince them of their Error. That Writer ſpeaks of *Lucifer*, on all Occaſions, with the greateſt Reſpect, even in the Book which he wrote againſt his Followers: he owns,

A Schiſm formed by Lucifer, *Biſhop of* Cagliari.

He never returned to the Communion of the Church.

[h] Ruf. l. 1. c. 28. Ath. ad Ruf. t. 2. p. 41. Amb. de ſalv. p. 316. Aug. ep. 50. Hier. in Lucif. c. 7. [i] Bolland. Maii 20. p. 207. [k] Bar. ad ann. 371. n. 132.
[l] Ruf. l. 1. c. 30.

that his Intention was pure and upright; that it was not Pride, Thirſt after Glory, or a Deſire of tranſmitting his Name to Poſterity, but a miſtaken Zeal, that led him aſtray, and made him diſapprove what the others approved; he even diſtinguiſhes him with the Title of the *Bleſſed Lucifer* [m]. And hence *Baronius* concludes, that he returned to the Communion of the Church; for otherwiſe, ſays the Annaliſt [n], St. *Jerom* had never given him the Title of *Bleſſed*, or *Saint*. But that he did not return, is manifeſt, from the Silence of St. *Jerom* on that Head, and from the Authority of a cotemporary Writer quoted above: and hence I may draw a Concluſion far better grounded than that of *Baronius*; *viz.* that St. *Jerom* excuſed him on account of his good Intention; and, conſequently, that he did not hold the uncharitable Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, excluding from Salvation all who die out of her Communion, let their Intention be never ſo good. It is to be obſerved, that the *Luciferians* not only excluded from their Communion thoſe who had received the *Arian* Confeſſion, but all who communicated with them, even after they had anathematized that Confeſſion, and publicly embraced the Faith of *Nice*.

The Council of Alexandria *ſaves the Church from Ruin.*

The Reſolution taken by the Confeſſors in the Council of *Alexandria*, is ſaid to have ſaved the Church from utter Ruin. For had that prevailed, which was urged with ſo much Warmth by *Lucifer*, the Biſhops, who had choſen rather to ſign the *Arian* Confeſſion than forfeit their Sees, would have kept them in Defiance of a Decree made by a ſmall Number of their Collegues, and in all Likelihood excommunicated and depoſed, in their Turn, thoſe who had excommunicated and depoſed them: and, in that Caſe, the *Arian* Party, comprehending almoſt all the Biſhops of the Church, muſt have prevailed. But as nothing was required of them, to keep their Sees, beſides their renouncing the Confeſſion of *Rimini*, which they had embraced, and embracing that of *Nice*, which they had renounced, they readily complied with the Decree of the Council; inſomuch that the following Year 363. *Athanaſius*, in a Letter, which he wrote to the Emperor *Jovian*, immediately after the Death of *Julian*, could aſſure that Prince, that the Faith of *Nice* had been received, and was profeſſed, in all the Provinces of the Empire, which he enumerates; but omits thoſe of *Thrace*, *Bithynia*, and the *Helleſpont* [o], the Bi-

[m] Hier. in Lucif. p. 144. [n] Bar. ad ann. 371. n. 132. [o] Ath. ad Jov. t. 1. p. 246.

ſhops

ſhops there ſtill continuing obſtinately to maintain the Doctrine of *Arius*, and to reject the Faith of *Nice*, as we learn from *Sozomen* [p], *Socrates* [q], and *Baſil* [r]; nay, at *Conſtantinople*, the Orthodox had but a ſmall Chapel to aſſemble in, all the Churches being in Poſſeſſion of the *Arians*, under *Eudoxius*, a leading Man among the *Pure Arians*, who had uſurped that See [s]. For the better eſtabliſhing of the Orthodox Faith, after the violent Shock it had lately received, Councils were held in ſeveral Provinces of the Empire (A), and by

[p] Soz. l. 6. c. 10. [q] Socr. l. 4. c. 1. [r] Baſ. ep. 75. [s] Socr. ib.

(A) The Biſhops of *Gaul* aſſembled at *Paris* in 362. and, having firſt owned their Crime, in approving and ſigning the Confeſſion of *Rimini*, they acknowleged the Three Perſons of the Trinity to be of the ſame Nature and Subſtance, and condemned *Urſacius*, *Valens*, and *Auxentius* the *Arian* Biſhop of *Milan*. This Council was convened by St. *Hilarius*, Biſhop of *Poitiers*; and a Letter, which the Council wrote on this Occaſion, has been tranſmitted to us, among the Fragments of his Works. He is ſaid to have aſſembled ſeveral other Councils in *Gaul*, for the reeſtabliſhing of the Faith of *Nice*, which is all we know of them. The ſame Year 362. the Biſhops of *Italy* aſſembling, declared void and null the Acts of the Council of *Rimini*, embraced the Faith of *Nice*, and, with one Accord, anathematized *Urſacius* and *Valens*, as the leading Men of the *Arian* Party. There is, among the Fragments of St. *Hilarius*, a Letter on this Subject, from the *Italian* to the *Illyrian* Biſhops. Where this Council was held I find no-where recorded. In the Year 363. the Emperor *Jovian* deſiring to be inſtructed in the Faith of the Catholic Church, by *Athanaſius* and the *Egyptian* Biſhops, who were come to wait on him, they aſſembled in Council, and agreed to propoſe no other Creed to him but that of *Nice*. At the ſame time they condemned the Hereſy of *Macedonius*, denying the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt. This Council is generally thought to have been held at *Alexandria*. But, from the Letter, which they preſented to the Emperor, it appears to have conſiſted of ſome *Egyptian* Biſhops, who, as it is there ſaid, were appointed to repreſent all the others of the ſame Province (1). Had the Council been held at *Alexandria*, they had, I ſhould think, been all preſent. It muſt therefore have aſſembled in ſome Place out of *Egypt*; and where more likely than at *Antioch*? For there the Emperor was this very Year, and there *Athanaſius* waited on him. The ſame Year another Council was held at *Antioch*, under *Melecius* Biſhop of that City. In that Council *Acacius*, Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Palæſtine*, who had been at the Head of the *Arian* Party, in the Latter-end of the Reign of *Conſtantius*, and his Followers, commonly ſtyled *Acacians*, embraced the Faith of *Nice*, and admitted the Term *Conſubſtantial*. *Acacius* had no other Faith but that of the Party which prevailed. Hence, in the Time of *Jovian*, who favoured the Orthodox Party, he profeſſed the Faith of *Nice*; but Two Years after he had ſigned it, he joined the *Arians* anew, ſeeing them in great Favour with the Emperor *Valens*. Several other Councils were held, from the Year 363. to 368. of which we have no particular Account. For *Athanaſius* tells us, in general Terms, that many Councils aſſembled in *France*, in *Spain*, at *Rome*, in *Dalmatia*, in *Dardania*, in *Macedonia*, in *Epirus*, in *Greece*, in *Candia*, and the other Iſlands, in *Sicily*, in *Cyprus*, in *Lycia*, in *Iſauria*, in *Egypt*, and in *Arabia*; and that they all met to maintain the Orthodox Faith, the Faith of the Council of *Nice* (2). In his Letter to the Emperor *Jovian* he aſſures him, that the Symbol of *Nice* was received in the above-mentioned Provinces, and, beſides, in *Britain*, in *Africa*, in *Pamphylia*, in *Libya*, in *Pontus*, in *Cappadocia*, and in the Eaſt, that is, in the Patriarchate of *Antioch* (3). But in the Provinces of *Thrace*, of *Bithynia*, and the *Helleſpont*, the *Semi-Arians* prevailed, till they were overpowered by the *Arians*, ſtrongly ſupported by the Emperor *Valens*, a moſt zealous Defender of *Arianiſm*.

(1) Theod. l. 4. c. 3. (2) Athan. de Afr. & ad Epict. (3) Id. ad Jov.

The Faith of Nice *every-where eſtabliſhed.*

all was received the Faith of *Nice*, the Confeſſion of *Rimini* condemned, and the Words *Subſtance* and *Conſubſtantial* re-eſtabliſhed [t]. A very ſtrong Proof, that the Aſſent given before to the *Arian* Doctrines; had been ſolely the Effect of Force, or of Intereſt, which being now removed, and all left at Liberty to act as their Conſciences only directed, the Orthodox Faith prevailed as much as the other had done under *Conſtantius*.

A Council convened by the Semi-Arians.

As every one was allowed by *Julian* to believe what he pleaſed, and to own his Belief, whatever it was, the *Semi-Arians* convened a Council, ſoon after the Death of *Conſtantius*, who, in the Latter-end of his Life, had begun to perſecute them a much as he had favoured them before. This Council was compoſed of thoſe chiefly who had aſſiſted at that of *Seleucia*, of which I have ſpoken above; and they all agreed to condemn and anathematize the Doctrine of the *Pure Arians*, with the Confeſſion of *Rimini*, and to ſign anew the Confeſſion of *Antioch*, eſtabliſhing a Likeneſs in Subſtance between the Son and the Father. Thus they pretended to keep a due Mean between the Two oppoſite Extremes, of the Weſtern Biſhops, whoſe *Conſubſtantiality*, they ſaid, left no room for the Diſtinction of Perſons; and of the *Pure Arians*, who denied all Likeneſs [u]. It was after this Council that the *Semi-Arians*, ſeparating themſelves from the Communion of the *Pure Arians*, began to form a diſtinct Sect, and to be called *Macedonians*; which Name was given them from *Macedonius*, late Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, but depoſed by the *Pure Arians*, in the Council they held in that City in 360. to make room for their great Champion *Eudoxius*, tranſlated formerly from *Germanicia* to *Antioch*, and now from *Antioch* to *Conſtantinople*. They were alſo named *Marathonians*, from *Marathonius*, Biſhop of *Nicomedia*, who, together with *Macedonius*, was at the Head of the Party; and *Pneumætomics*, that is, Enemies to the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe Divinity they denied, which was their chief, if not their only Error; for ſome are of Opinion, that tho' they rejected the Word *Conſubſtantial*, yet they agreed with the Orthodox in the Meaning of it. They led very regular, auſtere, and edifying Lives; and are, on that Score, highly commended and extolled by *Gregory Nazianzen* [w]. No Wonder therefore, that they ſoon ſpread all over the Eaſt, and gained every-where great Numbers of Followers. At *Conſtantinople*, and in the neighbouring Cities and Provinces, they

The Sect of the Macedonians.

[t] Ath. ad Afr. p. 931. & ad Epict. p. 582. [u] Soz. l. 5. c. 14. [w] Greg. Naz. orat. 44.

were

were followed not only by the greater Part of the People, but by ſome Perſons of Diſtinction, by ſuch as were moſt remarkable for their Piety, by intire Monaſteries, both of Men and Women [x]. The Inhabitants of *Cyzicus* in the *Propontis* were almoſt all of this Sect, and we are told of ſome Miracles wrought by a *Macedonian* of that Place [y], which *Baronius* will not allow, though as well atteſted as any he relates.

They are perſecuted by the Emperor Valens.

The Emperor *Valens*, who reigned in the Eaſt, which had been yielded to him by his Brother *Valentinian*, when he took him for his Collegue in the Empire, ſpared no Pains to reconcile this Sect with that of the *Arians*, which he greatly favoured. But, finding them no leſs averſe to the *Arians* than the Orthodox themſelves, he began in the Year 366. to perſecute them with great Cruelty. To avoid this Perſecution they reſolved to recur to the Emperor *Valentinian*, and, embracing the Faith profeſſed by him and the Weſtern Biſhops, to put themſelves under his Protection. Accordingly they diſpatched Three of their Body, *viz. Euſtathius* Biſhop of *Sebaſte*, *Sylvanus* of *Tarſus*, and *Theophilus* of *Caſtabala*, to acquaint the Emperor, in the Name of the reſt, with the Reſolution they had taken, and implore his Protection [z]. Theſe, being informed, on their Arrival in *Italy*, that *Valentinian* was waging War with the Barbarians on the Borders of *Gaul*, inſtead of repairing to him, which they apprehended might be attended with no ſmall Danger, went ſtrait to *Rome*, and there delivered to *Liberius* Letters from their Brethren, directed to him, and to the other Biſhops of the Weſt, whom they earneſtly intreated to uſe their Intereſt with the Emperor, in their Behalf, aſſuring them, that they ſincerely renounced the Errors they had hitherto held, and embraced the Catholic Faith, as explained and defined by the Council of *Nice* [a]. But *Liberius*, notwithſtanding theſe Aſſurances, ſuſpected their Sincerity; and therefore could not, by any means, be prevailed upon to communicate with them, or even to hear them, till they had delivered to him a Confeſſion of Faith, under their Hand, and in the Name of the whole Party, wherein they anathematized thoſe of *Rimini*, and *Nice* in *Bithynia*; condemned the Hereſy of *Arius*, with all other Hereſies; and received the Definitions of the Council of *Nice*, thoſe particularly that related to *Conſubſtantiality*. To this Confeſſion they added a ſolemn Proteſtation, declaring themſelves ready to ſubmit to the Sentence of

Deliver to Liberius *their Confeſſion of Faith.*

[x] Ruf. l. 1. c. 25. [y] Socr. l. 2. c. 45. l. 4. c. 4. l. 5. c. 8. [z] Id. l. 4. c. 12. Soz. l. 6. c. 10. [a] Soz. Socr. ib.

such Judges as the Pope should think fit to appoint, should they, or those by whom they had been sent, be ever for the future accused or suspected of swerving in the least from the Faith they now embraced and professed [b]. In virtue of this Confession, whereof the Original was carefully lodged in the Archives of the Church of *Rome*, *Liberius* admitted the Deputies to his Communion; and, upon their Departure, wrote, in the Name of all the Bishops of *Italy*, and the West, to the *Macedonian* Bishops, of whom he names 59, signifying the great Joy, which their Letters, and the Confession of Faith, signed by their Deputies, had occasioned at *Rome*, and in all the Western Churches, since by such a Confession they were all again happily united in one Faith. In this Letter *Liberius* assures them, that all the Bishops, who had assisted at the Council of *Rimini*, had retracted the Doctrine, which they had been forced to sign there; and were more than ever incensed against the *Arians*, on account of the Violence, which, at their Instigation, had been offered them [c]. The *Macedonians* admitted the Divinity of the Son, but denied that of the Holy Ghost; nay, this was their favourite Doctrine, and, as it were, the Characteristic of their Sect; but *Liberius*, and the other Western Bishops, not suspecting them of such an Error, which in all Likelihood they had not yet publicly owned, admitted them to their Communion, without examining them on that Head.

who admits them to his Communion.

Liberius *dies.*

Liberius died soon after, that is, on the 23d or 24th of *September*, of the present Year 366. as we are told by *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, whose Authority is preferable to that of any other, since, at this very time, they lived at *Rome* [d]. He had been chosen on the 22d of *May* 352. so that he governed the Church of *Rome* Fourteen Years, Four Months, and a Day or Two. *Liberius* lived in troublesome Times, the worst the Church had ever yet seen. She had Two dangerous Enemies to contend with at the same time, the Power of the Prince then on the Imperial Throne, and the Craft of a most subtle and deceitful Party. The Prince employed all his Power to overcome, with Oppression, those whom the Party could not over-reach with their Craft; and the Party to over-reach with their Craft such as the Prince could not overcome with Oppression. On the other hand, the Prelates, even some who were reputed the Pillars of the Church, seemed to have lost that Zeal, Firmness, and Intrepidity, which they had so

The deplorable Condition of the Church in his Time.

[b] Socr. ib. [c] Socr. l. 4. c. 12. Basil. ep. 82. [d] Marcell. & Faust. p. 4, 5.

gloriously

glorioufly exerted under the Pagan Princes, and few were found among them, whoſe Virtue was proof againſt the Loſs of their Dignity, or Exile. Hence the Defection became general, and the Orthodox Party was brought ſo low, that it muſt have been utterly quaſhed, had *Conſtantius* lived a few Years longer. But Providence interpoſed; *Conſtantius* died while he was purſuing his Scheme with the greateſt Succeſs; and *Julian*, his Succeſſor, by betraying an equal Hatred and Averſion to Chriſtians of all Denominations, obliged them to forget their Quarrels among themſelves, to lay aſide their Animoſity againſt each other, and to unite in their mutual Defence againſt him, as a common Enemy. *Jovian*, who ſucceeded him, proved no leſs favourable to the Orthodox, than *Conſtantius* had been to the *Arians*. Many therefore of the latter, and among the reſt *Acacius*, who was at the Head of the *Pure Arians*, to gain the Favour of the Emperor, publicly renounced the Doctrine of *Arius*, and embraced that of *Nice*. *Jovian*, after a ſhort Reign of Seven Months and Twenty Days, was ſucceeded by *Valentinian*, who continued to countenance the Orthodox, as his Predeceſſor had done, though he did not uſe the *Arians* with that Rigour which ſome Zealots expected from a Confeſſor, which Title he had deſerved under *Julian*. However, as he profeſſed the Orthodox Faith, that Party univerſally prevailed; inſomuch that, in a very ſhort time, no Traces of *Arianiſm* were left in the Weſt, except at *Milan*, under the *Arian* Biſhop *Auxentius*, and in a few Cities of *Illyricum*, where it was kept up by *Urſacius*, *Valens*, *Germinius*, and their Diſciples, till the following Century, when it was every-where re-eſtabliſhed there by the *Goths*.

Baronius aſcribes to *Liberius* the baniſhing of *Arianiſm* out of the Weſt, and the eſtabliſhing of the Orthodox Faith in its room; but that Glory was owing, according to *Ruffinus*, to *Hilarius* of *Poitiers*, and *Euſebius* of *Vercelli*, who, like the Two great Luminaries of the Univerſe, to uſe his Words, enlightened with their Rays *Illyricum*, *Gaul*, and *Italy*, diſpelling every-where the Darkneſs of Hereſy [e]. He minutely deſcribes the great Succeſs that attended them, with the Difficulties and Obſtructions they met with in ſo pious and commendable an Undertaking [f]. But, as for *Liberius*, he does not ſo much as mention him. And truly, from the Year 357. in which he fell, to his admitting the *Macedonians* to his Communion in 366. which was the

By whom Arianiſm was baniſhed out of the Weſt.

[e] Ruf. l. 1. c. 30, 31. [f] Idem ib.

laſt

last of his Life, the only thing I find recorded of him in the Antients, is his writing a Letter to the Catholic Bishops of *Italy*, wherein he exhorts them to atone for their past Conduct by renouncing the Errors of the *Arians*, and receiving anew the Symbol of *Nice*. He adds, that as this is the only Atonement, which it has been thought proper to require of them, they ought to exert their Zeal against the Authors of the Fault they committed, in proportion to the Grief they must feel for committing it [g]. This Letter has been transmitted to us among the Fragments of *Hilarius*. It is hard to guess what could induce *Baronius* to write so confidently as he does, that *Vincentius* of *Capua* assisted at the Council of *Rimini* with the Character of the Pope's Legate [h]. In what antient Author did he find the least Intimation or distant Hint of such a Legation? *Vincentius* of *Capua*, though a Person of great Eminency, is not even mentioned by any of the contemporary Writers, who relate the Transactions of that Council, and name the chief Prelates who composed it. 'Tis true we read of him, in one Author, that he never consented to the Confession of *Rimini* [i]: but that is said of *Liberius* too [k], whom *Baronius* owns not to have been present at that Assembly.

Neiher Vincentius *of* Capua, *nor* Liberius, *assisted at the Council of* Rimini.

Liberius, notwithstanding his Fall, is honoured both by the *Latin* and *Greek* Churches as a Saint. By the former his Festival is kept on the 23d of *September*, and by the latter on the 27th of *August* [l]. He erected a Church on the *Esquiline* Mount at *Rome*, which bore his Name, and was called the *Basilic of* Liberius, till it was consecrated to the Virgin *Mary* by *Sixtus* III. when it took the Name of *Sancta Maria Major*, or *Saint Mary the Greater*. It owes its Foundation, as is universally believed in the Church of *Rome*, to the following Miracle. A *Roman* of the Patrician Order, and of Wealth equal to his Rank, named *John*, having no Children, resolved to make a free Gift of his whole Estate to the Virgin *Mary*. This Resolution he imparted to his Wife, who consenting to it with great Alacrity, the Estate was immediately made over to the holy Virgin, whom they thenceforth jointly intreated, in their daily Prayers, to let them know by some Token in what Manner she chose to dispose of it. Their Prayers were heard, and, on the Night preceding the 5th of *August*, when the Heat is most violent at *Rome*, a miraculous Snow fell from Heaven, which covered Part of the *Esquiline* Mount. The same

Liberius *is honoured as a Saint.*

The Founding of the Church of St. Mary the Greater.

[g] Hil. frag. 1. p. 37, 38. [h] Bar. ad ann. 359. n. 3. [i] Theoph. l. 2. c. 13.
[k] Id. ib. [l] Menæa. p. 293.

Night

Night the Patrician and his Wife were admoniſhed in a Dream to build a Church on the Spot of Ground which they ſhould find covered with Snow. Early next Morning they went to acquaint Pope *Liberius* with what had happened, whom they found to have had the ſame Dream; ſo that no room being now left to doubt of the Revelation, the Pope appointed a grand Proceſſion of the whole Clergy, in which he walked himſelf, attended by Crouds of People, to the above-mentioned Mount; and there, having cauſed the Snow, which ſtill lay unmelted, to be removed, on the Spot, which it had covered, he laid the Foundation of that magnificent Baſilic, which was reared at the Expence of the Patrician, and is now known by the Name of *Saint Mary the Greater*, and *Saint Mary in the Snow* [m]. I ſhould not have thought ſuch an idle Tale worthy of a Place in a grave Hiſtory, were it not recorded in the moſt authentic Book the Church of *Rome* has after the Scripture, the *Roman Breviary*, a Book approved and commended by the Council of *Trent*, and by the ſpecial Bulls of Three Popes, *Pius* V. *Clement* VIII. and *Urban* VIII. of whom the latter declares every thing it contains to be extracted from antient and approved Authors, and to be agreeable to Truth [n]. So that it would be leſs dangerous, at leaſt in *Italy*, to deny any Truth revealed in the Scripture, than to queſtion any Fable related in the *Breviary*. The Feaſt of *the Snow*, or *St. Mary in the Snow*, is kept annually at *Rome*, on the 5th of *Auguſt*, with the greateſt Solemnity. The College of Cardinals aſſiſts that Day at Divine Service in the Church of *Saint Mary the Greater*; and the Pope, if not indiſpoſed, or otherwiſe prevented, officiates in Perſon: the *Primicerio*, or Dean of that Church, reads the Account, which I have delivered above; and, that nothing may be wanting to complete the Farce, Numbers of Children are employed, during the Service, to drop Jeſſamins from the Gallery on the Congregation, in Remembrance and Imitation of the miraculous Snow. And truly by Children alone ſuch Fables are proper to be acted and believed.

The Writings of Liberius.

Several Pieces have reached our Times, which were either written by, or have been falſly aſcribed to, *Liberius*. Among the former are, his Letter in Anſwer to the *Macedonian* Biſhops; another to the Catholic Biſhops of *Italy*; which have been both mentioned above;

[m] Breviar. Rom. 5 Aug.

[n] Vide Bull. Urb. VIII. Breviario præfix.

and a Diſcourſe, which he pronounced on *Chriſtmas-day* in the Church of St. *Peter*, on Occaſion of his giving the ſacred Veil to *Marcellina* the Siſter of St. *Ambroſe*, when ſhe embraced the State of Virginity. This Diſcourſe St. *Ambroſe* has inſerted in his Third Book on Virgins, but in his own Style, which is very different from that of *Liberius*, who had not the Gift of Eloquence [o]. Among the Pieces falſly aſcribed to *Liberius*, moſt Men of Learning reckon the Confeſſion of Faith, written in *Greek*, which he is ſuppoſed to have ſent to *Athaſius*. This Piece *Baronius* will, by all means, have to be genuine; and the Uſe he makes of it is ſomewhat extraordinary. The Council of *Alexandria*, to which the Church owed her Safety, was convened by *Athanaſius*, upon his Return from Exile, as I have related above. By that ſmall Aſſembly, conſiſting only of Confeſſors, was enacted the famous Decree with reſpect to thoſe, who had communicated with the *Arians*, and ſigned the Confeſſion of *Rimini*. To that Decree the whole Church readily conformed; ſo that the Honour of ſaving the Church was chiefly owing to *Athanaſius*, and wholly to him and the other Confeſſors. Of *Liberius* not the leaſt Mention is made; ſo that he had no Share in that Glory. The *Annaliſt* therefore, not being able to bring in his Sovereign Pontiff upon the Authority of any Records now extant, has recourſe to thoſe that probably never were; or, if they ever were, are now no more. He ſuppoſes Part of the above-mentioned Confeſſion of Faith, ſent by *Liberius* to *Athanaſius*, to be wanting; and *Liberius*, in the Part that is wanting, to have impowered *Athanaſius* to convene a Council, and to have appointed *Euſebius* of *Vercelli*, and *Lucifer* of *Cagliari*, to aſſiſt at that Council with the Character of his Legates. Such wild and extravagant Suppoſitions require a very ſtrong Proof to ſupport them, ſome plauſible Conjectures at leaſt to give them an Appearance of Truth. But that we muſt not expect of *Baronius*. The only Argument, if it may be ſo called, which he pretends to offer on this Occaſion, is, that he cannot conceive *Athanaſius*, and the other holy Confeſſors, would have taken upon them to act as they did, and enact a Decree extending to the whole Church, had they not received ſuch a Power from him, to whom all Power was given [p], meaning the Pope. The other Pieces falſly aſcribed to *Liberius*, are another Letter to *Athanaſius*,

Writings falſly aſcribed to him.

Strange Conjectures of Baronius.

[o] Amb. de virg. l. 3. p. 437.

[p] Bar. ad ann. 362. n. 206.

and

and one to all the Catholic Biſhops; which are both reputed ſuppoſititious, being dated by Conſuls who never exiſted.

VALENTINIAN, VALENS, **DAMASUS,** GRATIAN, THEODOSIUS.

Thirty-ſixth BISHOP *of* Rome.

LIBERIUS was ſucceeded by *Damaſus*, whom the *Spaniſh* Writers, upon the Authority of *Anaſtaſius*, ſuppoſe to have been a Native of *Spain* [q]; though there is no room to doubt of his being born in *Rome*, ſince it appears, from an Inſcription quoted by *Baronius* [r], that his Father had been Lector, Deacon, and Presbyter, of the Church of St. *Laurence* in that City, and conſequently muſt have lived there from his Youth. *Damaſus* had a Siſter named *Irene*, who embraced the State of Virginity, and died before ſhe was Twenty, as we read in her Epitaph [s]. It is not therefore probable that her Death happened in the Twelfth Year of her Brother's Pontificate, as the *Spaniſh* Author of her Life tells us, he being then Seventy. *Damaſus* ſerved, as his Father had done, the Church of St. *Laurence*, till he was ſtricken in Years; for he was upwards of Sixty when raiſed to the Epiſcopal Dignity. He was Deacon of *Rome* in 355. when *Liberius* was ſent into Exile; on which Occaſion he not only bound himſelf, with the reſt of the Clergy, by a ſolemn Oath not to acknowlege any other Biſhop ſo long as *Liberius* lived, but attended him on his Journey to the Place of his Baniſhment [t]. *Marcellinus* and *Fauſtinus* ſeem to inſinuate, that ſoon afterwards, giving way to his Ambition, he forgot the Oath he had taken, abandoned *Liberius*, for whom he had profeſſed the greateſt Friendſhip, and ſided with *Felix* his Antagoniſt [u]. But theſe Two Presbyters were zealous Partiſans of the Antipope *Urſinus*, of whom hereafter; and therefore we ought to be very cautious of what they write to the Prejudice of *Damaſus*. *Jerom*, who lived then at *Rome*, and in great Intimacy with *Damaſus*, reproaches ſuch of the Eccleſiaſtics as forſook *Liberius*, and joined *Felix*, with the Breach of a moſt ſolemn Oath; ſtyles them

Year of Chriſt 366.

Damaſus *a Native of* Rome,

and Deacon of that Church.

Whether he abandoned Liberius, *and ſided with* Felix.

[q] Anaſt. c. 38. [r] Bar. 384. 16. in appar. ad annal. [s] Boll. 21 Feb. p. 244.
[t] Marcell. & Fauſt. p. 3. [u] Id. p. 3—5.

Perjurers, Deserters, Time-servers, *&c.* which I cannot think he would have done so freely, had *Damasus* been one of the Number. I am therefore not a little surprised, that *Baronius* should blindly acquiesce to the Accounts of the above-mentioned Writers, and, without further Enquiry, condemn *Damasus* as guilty of Perjury, by ranking him among the Followers of *Felix* [w]. And yet the Annalist supposes him to have been appointed Great Vicar of *Rome* by *Liberius*, upon his withdrawing from the City to avoid the Persecution raised by *Constantius* after the Council of *Rimini* [x]: so that, according to him, he must have changed Sides anew, and, abandoning *Felix*, returned to *Liberius*, which is representing him as a Man swayed by no other Principles but those of Interest and Ambition, and therefore always siding with those who were uppermost. This is all we know of *Damasus* before his Election.

He is chosen Bishop of Rome, *and likewise* Ursinus.

Liberius dying on the 23d or 24th of *September* 366. as I have related above, great Disturbances were raised in *Rome* by the Election of Two Bishops to succeed him, *viz. Damasus* and *Ursinus*, whom the later Writers style *Ursicinus*, a Deacon of that Church. This double Election gave Rise to a dangerous Schism, and a kind of Civil War, within the Walls of the City, which did not end without a great deal of Bloodshed. I shall impartially relate what I find concerning this important Transaction in the cotemporary Writers of either Side, leaving the Reader to judge which of the Two Pretenders was the Cause of so much Mischief, and which legally chosen. I shall begin with the Account which *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, who were then at *Rome*, give us of these Elections. They were both Presbyters of that Church, but, being strict Followers of *Lucifer* Bishop of *Cagliari*, of whom I have spoken above, they and their whole Party were deemed Schismatics, and consequently cruelly persecuted by the Catholic Bishops, especially *Damasus*. Finding themselves thus oppressed, the Two Presbyters, between 383. and 388. drew up a Petition in Behalf of themselves and their afflicted Brethren, addressed to *Valentinian* II. *Theodosius*, and *Arcadius*, intreating those Princes to protect their Innocence, and put a Stop to the unbridled Rage of their Enemies. With this Request the Two Presbyters repaired to *Constantinople*, being driven from *Rome* by *Damasus*, and there presented it to *Theo-*

[w] Bar. ad ann. 357. n. 60. & ad ann. 367. n. 8.

[x] Id. ad ann. 359. n. 48.

dosius,

doſius, who, pitying their Condition, in his Reſcript directed to *Cynegius* the *Præfectus Prætorio*, treated them as Catholics, granted them the free Exerciſe of their Religion, and declared all thoſe wicked Men, nay, and Heretics, who had preſumed, or ſhould for the future preſume, to perſecute or moleſt them [y]. In the Preface, prefixed to this Petition, I find the following Account of both the abovementioned Elections. *Urſinus*, ſay they, was choſen in the Baſilic of *Julius* by the Deacons *Amantius* and *Lupus*, and the People, who had continued in the Communion of *Liberius*; but *Damaſus*, by thoſe who had adhered to *Felix*, aſſembled for that Purpoſe in the Church of St. *Laurence*, called *in Lucinis*. *Urſinus* was ordained the firſt, by *Paul* Biſhop of *Tivoli*; which *Damaſus*, who had always panted after the Epiſcopal Dignity, no ſooner knew, than he hired a great Number of Chariot-drivers, and other ſuch deſpicable Wretches, who, violently breaking into the Baſilic of *Julius*, maſſacred a great many People there. Seven Days afterwards they made themſelves Maſters of the *Lateran* Baſilic, and there was *Damaſus* ordained Biſhop [z]. This Account charges *Damaſus* alone with the Schiſm, and the Evils attending it. On the other hand, the Council of *Rome*, held about Twelve Years after, lays the whole Blame on *Urſinus*, who, ſay they, boldly attempted to uſurp a Dignity, which on no Score was due to him [a]; and that which met at *Aquileia* in 381. and conſiſted of all the moſt eminent Biſhops of the Weſt, aſcribes to *Urſinus*, and his Temerity, the many Calamities the Church had ſuffered; paints him as a Man of no Credit, Character, or Reputation; and adds, that he ſeized by Force what he had no Hopes of attaining by lawful Means [b]. *Ambroſe* writes, that the Suffrage of Heaven concurred in the Election of *Damaſus* [c]. According to theſe Authorities *Damaſus* was lawfully elected, and *Urſinus* unlawfully. As to the Particulars of his Election, *Jerom*, who perhaps was then at *Rome*, tells us, that *Damaſus* was firſt choſen, and then *Urſinus*, who, after his Election, ſeized by Force on the Baſilic of *Sicinus* [d], that is, according to the moſt probable Opinion, the Baſilic of *Liberius*, now *Saint Mary the Greater*. *Socrates* ſays, that *Urſinus* having near as many Votes as *Damaſus*, he was thereby encouraged to hold ſeparate Aſſemblies, and to get himſelf ordained in a dark and retired Corner of

Different Accounts of theſe Elections.

[y] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 18, 100, 103. Gennad. c. 16.
[z] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 5, 6.
[a] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 8.
[b] Ibid. p. 68, 69, 71.
[c] Amb. ep. 11. tom. 5.
[d] Hier. chron.

the Basilic of *Sicinus* [e]. *Ruffinus* assures us, that *Damasus* was already ordained, when *Ursinus*, transported with Rage at his being preferred to him, assembled a great Number of seditious People, and, supported by them, caused himself, in Defiance of the Canons of the Church, to be ordained, in the Basilic of *Sicinus*, by *Paul* Bishop of *Tivoli*; whereas the Bishops of *Rome* were always ordained and consecrated by those of *Ostia*. After his Consecration, continues this Author, he ordained several Persons; which was adding a Sacrilege to his unlawful Election [f]. Both *Ruffinus*, and *Socrates*, who follows him, were certainly mistaken as to the Place of this Ordination, since we are told by *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, that *Ursinus* was ordained, not in the Basilic of *Sicinus*, but in that of *Julius* [g]. These Two Writers, who were in *Rome* at the Time of the Elections, tell us, in expres Terms, that *Ursinus* was chosen before *Damasus*; and *Jerom*, who was probably in *Rome* at the same time, assures us, in Terms no less expres, that *Damasus* was chosen before *Ursinus*. The former were greatly addicted to *Ursinus*, and the latter no less attached to *Damasus*. As for the Two Councils, which I have quoted above, they were held some Years after, when the Party of *Damasus* had universally prevailed; and it was a Crime to acknowlege *Ursinus*. *Jerom* has been followed by most of the Writers who came after, and the Authority of the other Two quite disregarded, for no other Reason bnt because they were Schismatics; for they joined *Lucifer*, as I have observed above, and refused to communicate with the Bishops who had signed the Confession of *Rimini*, nay, and with those who communicated with them.

Great Disturbances in Rome, *occasioned by this double Election.*

By this double Election the Citizens of *Rome* saw themselves, before they were aware, involved in a Civil War. The whole People were divided, some siding with *Damasus*, and some with *Ursinus*; and neither of the Competitors shewed the least Inclination to yield to the other. No Day passed without Skirmishes and Bloodshed; insomuch that *Juventius* Governor of the City, and *Julian* the *Præfects Annonæ*, to put a Stop to the present, and prevent greater Disturbances, agreed to banish *Ursinus*, whose Party seemed less powerful, together with his Two Deacons *Amantius* and *Lupus*. The Two Authors I have often quoted write, that both *Juventius* and *Julian* were bribed by *Damasus*, who, taking Advantage of the Absence of

[e] Socr. l. 4. c. 24. [f] Ruff. l. 2. c. 10. [g] Marc. & Faust. p. 5, 6.

his

his Competitor, armed his Followers with Clubs and Swords, hoping thus to intimidate the Friends of the exiled Biſhop, and bring them in the End to acknowlege him. Seven Presbyters of the Party of *Urſinus* were ſeized, at the Requeſt of *Damaſus*, in order to be ſent into Exile, but reſcued by the People of the ſame Party, and carried in Triumph to the Baſilic of *Liberius*; which *Damaſus* no ſooner heard, than, arming all his Followers, both Clergy and Laymen, with Clubs, Swords, Axes, *&c.* he marched at the Head of the ſeditious and enraged Multitude to the Baſilic, which he and his Partiſans immediately inveſted, and attacked with the utmoſt Fury. It was ſet on fire in ſeveral Places; the Doors were forced, the Roof uncovered, and thence Showers of Tiles diſcharged on the People aſſembled there: great was the Maſſacre; One hundred and Sixty Perſons, Men and Women, were inhumanly murdered on the Side of *Urſinus*, and a great many more wounded, ſome of whom died of their Wounds. On the Side of *Damaſus* not one ſingle Perſon was killed. This Riot began on the 25th of *October* 366. at Eight in the Morning.

Several Perſons maſſacred.

Thus the above-mentioned Writer [h]. *Ruffinus* writes in general Terms, that the illegal Election of *Urſinus*, in Oppoſition to *Damaſus*, occaſioned ſuch a Tumult, or rather Civil War among the People, ſome ſiding with the one, and ſome with the other, that the Places deſtined for Prayer ſtreamed with Human Blood [i]. The Heathen *Ammianus Marcellinus* aſſures us, that the Partiſans of *Damaſus* and *Urſinus* were ſo implacably incenſed againſt each other, that ſeveral Perſons were wounded in the Quarrel, and ſome killed: Nay, it is certain, adds he, that in the Baſilic of *Sicinus* One hundred and Thirty-ſeven Perſons were found dead, all killed the ſame Day: but *Damaſus* in the End, by the Efforts of his Party, got the better of his Antagoniſt [k]. *Jerom*, however partial, owns, that *Urſinus* having got Poſſeſſion of the Baſilic of *Sicinus*, the Partiſans of *Damaſus* repaired thither in Crouds, and that ſeveral Perſons were thereupon inhumanly maſſacred [l]. The Sedition became general, and the Seditious on either Side ſo numerous and powerful, that *Juventius*, not thinking it adviſable to puniſh, nor being able to appeaſe, the enraged Populace, abandoned the City, and retired to the Country [m]. He was perhaps for *Urſinus*, whoſe Party being over-matched by that of *Damaſus*, he might not think it ſafe to continue in *Rome*. Three Days after the Maſſacre in the

The Sedition becomes general.

[h] Id. p. 6, 7.
[i] Ruff. l. 2. c. 10.
[k] Ammian. Mar. l. 27. p. 337.
[l] Hier. chron.
[m] Ammian. ib.

Baſilic

Basilic of *Liberius*, that is, on the 28th of *October*, the Partisans of *Ursinus*, say *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, assembling, cried out aloud against *Damasus*, complaining of his Conduct, and begging that a sufficient Number of Bishops might be convened, and the Controversy referred to their Judgment and Decision [n]. *Damasus* was greatly favoured, and chiefly supported, by the *Roman* Ladies, which probably gave Occasion to the Charge of Adultery that was brought against him. But *Jerom*, either to clear him of this Charge, or to obviate the like Suspicions, naturally arising from his familiar Conversation with the Female Sex, styles him a *Virgin Doctor of the Virgin Church* [o].

Damasus *not easily cleared from all Guilt.*

Baronius finding he can neither disguise nor extenuate the Cruelties committed by those who adhered to *Damasus*, is at a great deal of Trouble to disculpate him, and lay the whole Blame on *Maximinus*, who, as appears from History, discharged the Office of *Præfectus Annonæ* from the Latter-end of the Year 367. to the Beginning of 370. and was noted for his Cruelty. *Baronius* is supported herein by the Authority of *Jerom* and *Ruffinus*, of whom the former writes, that *Damasus* remained Conqueror, without hurting the Conquered [p]; and the latter, that the Cruelties practised by the Prefect *Maximinus*, who had espoused the Cause of *Damasus*, upon those of the adverse Party, rendered the Name of that virtuous Prelate odious, though he had no Share in them [q]. But who is to be charged with the Massacre in the Basilic of *Sicinus*, or *Liberius?* On whom are the Murders to be laid, committed there? *Maximinus* was not then in Power, and perhaps not at *Rome*. I cannot help thinking but *Damasus* might at least have restrained his Followers from such Excesses; and consequently, as he did not, I cannot, with *Ruffinus*, conclude him to have had no Share in them; I say, *at least restrained*; for I will not charge him with heading and encouraging the riotous Multitude in that wicked Attempt, upon the bare Authority of *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, both zealous Partisans of *Ursinus*. But neither ought *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, *Davidius*, &c. upon the bare Testimony of Two Writers, no less sanguine in the Cause of *Damasus*, suppose him to have been noways concerned in those Disorders. The famous *Ammianus Marcellinus*, who lived at this very time in *Rome*, and, as a Pagan, was noways concerned in the Quarrel, nor more inclined

[n] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 9. [o] Hier. ep. 5. t. 2. [p] Hier. ep. 49. [q] Ruf. l. 2. c. 20.

to

to one Side than the other, aſſures us, that both were equally ambitious of the Epiſcopal Dignity, and both equally guilty [r]. The Authority of a Writer, thus unbyaſſed, and in every other reſpect unexceptionable, ought to be preferred, without the leaſt Heſitation, to that of any other, whom we have juſt Reaſon to ſuſpect of Partiality. *Jerom* indeed ſpeaks with more Modeſty and Reſerve than *Ruffinus*, and thoſe who have copied after him; for he only ſays, that *Damaſus* did not hurt his Enemies after he had conquered them. But, in relating the above-mentioned Maſſacre, and the Skirmiſhes that happened before the Party of *Damaſus* prevailed, he always deſcribes his Partiſans as the Aggreſſors, without ever pretending to excuſe him, as having no Share in thoſe Riots; which he would not have failed to do, had he not paid a greater Regard to Truth than *Ruffinus* ſeems to have done.

The Heathen *Marcellinus*, after telling us, that *Damaſus* and *Urſinus* aſpired with equal Ambition to the Epiſcopal Chair, adds this famous Remark, which I ſhall ſet down in his own Words: *I muſt own*, ſays he, *that when I reflect on the Pomp attending that Dignity, I do not at all wonder, that thoſe, who are fond of Shew and Parade, ſhould ſcold, quarrel, fight, and ſtrain every Nerve to attain it; ſince they are ſure, if they ſucceed, to be enriched with the Offerings of the Ladies; to appear no more abroad on foot, but in ſtately Chariots, and gorgeouſly attired; to keep coſtly and ſumptuous Tables; nay, and to ſurpaſs the Emperors themſelves in the Splendor and Magnificence of their Entertainments. But how happy would they be, if, deſpiſing the Grandeur of the City, which they allege to excuſe their Luxury, they followed the Example of ſome Biſhops in the Provinces, who, by the Temperance and Frugality of their Diet, the Poverty and Plainneſs of their Dreſs, the Modeſty of their Looks fixed on the Ground, the Purity of their Lives, and the Regularity of their whole Conduct, approve themſelves to the eternal God, and all his true Worſhipers* [s]*!* Thus *Ammianus*. And that *Damaſus* was fond of all that Pomp, Grandeur, and Parade, that he led ſuch a voluptuous Life, as *Ammianus* here ſo juſtly cenſures and condemns in the Biſhops of *Rome*, is not to be doubted, ſince *Prætextatus*, a Man of the firſt Quality, honoured with the greateſt Employments of the Empire, and zealouſly attached to Paganiſm, in

The Luxury of the Biſhops of Rome.

[r] Ammian. l. 27. p. 337. [s] Id. ib. p. 337, 338.

converſing familiarly with him, uſed pleaſantly to ſay, *Make me Biſhop of* Rome, *and I'll immediately turn Chriſtian* [t]. But, as I ſhall have Occaſion to ſpeak of this Subject hereafter, I ſhall only obſerve here, that the Offerings of thoſe devout Women, and other pious Chriſtians, were no better employed in the Days of *Damaſus*, than the immenſe Wealth, which the Church of *Rome* acquired in After-Ages, by the voluntary Contributions of all the Chriſtian Nations, is diſpoſed of in ours. With theſe Offerings the Biſhops of *Rome* uſed, in more early Times, to maintain the Poor of their own Church, and ſend the Overplus to other Churches, where the Poor were numerous, and the Offerings ſmall. Of this generous Practice I have mentioned ſome Inſtances, that well deſerved to be recorded. But when Ambition began to take place of Charity, the Poor were forgotten, and nothing thought of but ſplendid Equipages, numerous Retinues, princely Apparel, ſumptuous Tables, and whatever elſe could feed the Vanity of theſe upſtart Princes, and put them upon the Level with the greateſt Monarchs. To ſuch Purpoſes were the Oblations of the Faithful perverted. *Baronius* takes it very much amiſs of *Ammianus*, that he ſhould find Fault with the coſtly Tables and Entertainments of the Popes, ſince it is manifeſt from St. *Auſtin*, that the Chriſtians at *Rome*, and, no doubt, the Pope with the reſt, kept a rigorous Faſt Three Days in the Week [u]; ſo that, in his Opinion, they ought not to be blamed for rioting Four Days in the Week, provided they faſted Three. But to this Doctrine *Ammianus* was a Stranger, and therefore, notwithſtanding the Faſts they might keep, he juſtly cenſured their expenſive Tables and Banquets, as no-ways ſuited to their Profeſſion and Character.

How the Oblations of the Faithful diſpoſed of.

But to return to *Urſinus*; he had been baniſhed *Rome* by the Prefect *Juventius*, before the 26th of *October* 366. as I have related above; but the Emperor *Valentinian*, who was at this time in *Gaul*, having, at the Requeſt of his Friends, granted him Leave to return, he entered the City on the 15th of *September* 367. in a kind of Triumph, being met and received with loud Acclamations by thoſe of his Party [w]. At the ſame time the Emperor directed a Reſcript to *Prætextatus*, who had ſucceeded *Juventius* in the Prefecture of *Rome*, injoining him to recall all thoſe, who had been baniſhed for the late Riots, and reinſtate them in their former Condition, after

Urſinus *recalled by* Valentinian;

[t] Hier. ep. 61. t. 2. [u] Aug. ep. 86. Bar. ann. 367. n. 10. [w] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 6—9.

warning them, that if, for the future, they diſturbed the Peace of the Public, they ſhould be puniſhed without Mercy [x]. But notwithſtanding this Warning, new Diſturbances muſt have happened, ſince *Urſinus* was, by an Order from the Emperor, baniſhed again on the 16th of *November* of the ſame Year 367. together with Seven of his Followers, who were all confined to different Places in *Gaul*, where they continued till the Year 371 [y]. The Two Presbyters tell us, that *Damaſus*, having, with large Sums, gained the Miniſters and Favourites at Court, by their Means extorted from the Emperor the abovementioned Order. They add, that the Friends of *Urſinus* were reſolved to ſtand by him; but that he, to prevent Bloodſhed, delivered himſelf up into the Hands of the Officers of Juſtice [z]. However that be, by the Baniſhment of *Urſinus*, and ſome of the leading Men of his Party, Tranquillity was reſtored for a while, and the Diſturbances compoſed, ſays *Ammianus*, which the Chriſtians had raiſed by quarreling among themſelves [a].

but baniſhed anew.

About this Time the Emperor *Valentinian* enacted a Law, impowering the Biſhop of *Rome* to examine and judge other Biſhops, that religious and eccleſiaſtical Diſputes might not be decided by profane or ſecular Judges, but by a *Pontiff of the ſame Religion, and his Collegues* [b]. A very imprudent Law, conſidering the Nature and Conſequences of ſuch a Conceſſion. The Biſhops aſſembled in Council at *Rome*, in 378. after declaring, in the ſtrongeſt Terms, their Approbation of this Law, agreed to preſent an Addreſs to the Emperor *Gratian*, wherein they earneſtly recommended to him the Execution of it, becauſe it greatly redounded, ſay they, to the Honour of the ſacred Miniſtry; becauſe the Judgment of Biſhops was more ſure and certain than that of any Civil Magiſtrate; and, laſtly, becauſe it delivered the Prelates of the Church from the juſt Concern they were under, to find that they could not make their Innocence appear without Racks and Tortures, which innocent Perſons were put to by the Secular Judges [c]. This Exemption ſeems to have been underſtood by the Council as extending to all Caſes, whether Civil or Eccleſiaſtical. Be that as it will, whatever Exemption was by the abovementioned Law granted to the Biſhops, whatever Power was by that Law veſted in the Biſhop of *Rome*, and his Collegues, the Council, with a due Senſe of Gratitude, acknowleged ſuch Power and Immu-

The Biſhop of Rome *impowered by the Emperor to judge other Biſhops.*

[x] Vide Bar. ad Ann. 368. n. 4 [y] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 9, 10. [z] Idem ib.
[a] Ammian. l. 27. p. 349. [b] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 80. [c] Id. p. 81.

nity to be intirely owing to the Indulgence of the Emperor: a plain Proof that the absurd and chimerical Notion of a *Divine Right* was not yet broached. The Bishops chose rather to be judged by the Pope and his Collegues, that is, by their own Brethren, than by Lay Judges, for the Reasons they allege in their Address to *Gratian*. Hence they chearfully submitted to his Judgment, and applauded every new Power that was granted him, as redounding to the Honour of the Episcopal Order. But, alas! they were not aware, that every new Power, yielded to the Bishop of *Rome*, was a new Link added to the Chain, they were forging, if not for themselves, for those, at least, who were to succeed them. They little apprehended, that the Bishop of *Rome* would, in Process of Time, claim all the Power vested in him, and his Collegues, as due to him alone, and that too by *Divine Right*; that, in virtue of such a Claim, he would set up for universal and sole Monarch of the Church, exercise an unbounded Authority and Jurisdiction, and degrade all other Bishops from his Collegues to his Vassals and Slaves. *Blondel* is of Opinion, that the Bishop of *Rome* was, by that Law, only impowered to judge the Bishops within the Limits of his Jurisdiction, that is, those of the Suburbicarian Provinces [d]. Others think that such a Power was only for a time, and extended to those Bishops alone who were concerned in the present Schism; which seems most probable, since *Valentinian* declares, that he enacted the above-mentioned Law to settle the Church, shaken by the Fury of the Schism [e].

The Followers of Ursinus *driven out of* Rome.

Ursinus, and the leading Men of his Party, being driven out of the City, the Inhabitants began to enjoy their former Peace and Tranquillity. But yet his Followers continued to assemble in the Cœmeteries of the Martyrs, and even kept Possession of a Church, supposed to be that of St. *Agnes*, without the Walls [f]. Of this *Damasus* took care to transmit an Account to the Emperor, in a Memorial; who, fearing that, from such a Spark, the Fire might break out again, which he had been striving to extinguish, injoined *Prætextatus* to put *Damasus* forthwith in Possession of that Church; and, in the Execution of this Order, probably happened what we find related, perhaps with some Exaggeration, by the Two Writers I have often quoted; for they tell us, that one Day, while the Followers of *Ursinus* were assembled, in great Numbers, in the Church of *St. Agnes*, *Damasus*,

[d] Blond. Prim. p. 165. Bar. ad ann. 368. [e] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 80. [f] Marc. & Faust. p. 19.

falling

falling unexpectedly upon them with his Satellites, made a dreadful Havock of the innocent and defenceleſs Multitude [g]. After this Second Maſſacre *Prætextatus*, to ſecure the Tranquillity of the City, ſent ſeveral more of the Party of *Urſinus* into Exile. *Valentinian*, however, would not conſent to their being confined to any particular Place; but gave them full Liberty to live where they pleaſed, provided they kept out of *Rome* [h]. The Two Writers add, that the Cruelties exerciſed in the Church of *St. Agnes* gave great Offence to the Biſhops of *Italy*; and that *Damaſus*, having invited ſome of them to *Rome*, to ſolemnize with him the Anniverſary of his Conſecration; he laid hold of that Opportunity to ſolicit them with Intreaties, nay, and to tempt them with Money, to condemn *Urſinus*; but all in vain; the Biſhops, equally unmoved by his Prayers and Offers, refuſing, with great Firmneſs and Reſolution, to condemn a Man whom they had not heard. *Marcellinus* and *Fauſtinus* cloſe their Preface with a ſhort Account of themſelves, telling us, that the Preſbyters of *Urſinus*'s Party were impriſoned, racked, baniſhed, diſperſed, and ſent into different Countries; and that they themſelves, who were of that Number, preſented a Petition to the Emperors, begging them to put a Stop to ſo cruel a Perſecution [i].

Damaſus having thus, in the End, by the Favour of the Emperors, intirely got the better of the adverſe Party, and ſecured his Dignity, he turned his Thoughts to Eccleſiaſtical Matters. In the Weſt there were now but Three Biſhops, who ſtill maintained the Doctrine of *Arius*; *viz.* *Urſacius* Biſhop of *Singidunum*, *Valens* of *Murſa*, and *Auxentius* of *Milan*. *Damaſus*, however, convened a numerous Council at *Rome*; and there examined anew, and anew condemned, the Tenets of *Arius*, and all who held them, namely *Urſacius* and *Valens* [k]. *Auxentius* was a pure, and no leſs zealous, *Arian*, than either of theſe Two; but, as he was in favour with *Valentinian*, whom he had deceived by an equivocal Confeſſion of Faith, *Damaſus*, and his Council, thought it adviſeable not to name him. The Council wrote a ſynodal Letter to the other Biſhops, acquainting them with what had paſſed; which was anſwered by *Athanaſius*, and the Biſhops of *Egypt*, then aſſembled at *Alexandria*. In their Anſwer they thank *Damaſus* for condemning *Urſacius* and *Valens*; but, at the ſame time, expreſs no ſmall Surprize to find, that *Auxentius* was

Damaſus *aſſembles a Council at* Rome.

Urſacius *and* Valens *condemned.*

Auxentius *why ſpared.*

[g] Id. p. 10, 11. [h] Vide Bar. ad ann. 368. n. 3. [i] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 11, 12. [k] Ath. ad Afr. p. 931.

not

not yet deposed, tho' guilty not only of *Arianism*, but of many other Crimes, which they enumerate [l]. *Damasus* and his Collegues paid, no doubt, great Regard to the Remonstrances of *Athanasius*; but, as *Auxentius* was supported by the Emperor, and they were better Courtiers than *Athanasius*, they never attempted to depose him; nay, they carried their Complaisance so far as to condemn *Ursacius* and *Valens*, as if they had been the only *Arian* Bishops in the West, without ever naming *Auxentius*. He therefore kept, for many Years, quiet Possession of the See he had usurped, and was at last deprived of it by Death alone.

The Avarice of the Roman *Clergy restrained by* Valentinian.

The many Abuses and Disorders, that reigned at this Time among the Ecclesiastics of *Rome*, offered a larger Field to the Zeal of *Damasus*, than the Heresy of *Arius*, now confined in the West to a Corner of *Illyricum*. But he was by no means a fit Person to set up for a Reformer of Manners, and the Evil required a more powerful Remedy than he could apply. The Prelates of the Church, even the Bishops of *Rome*, could yet only preach against Vice, admonish the Vicious, and inflict ecclesiastical Censures on such as gave no Ear to their Admonitions: all other Power was still lodged in Lay Hands, and only imparted to the Ecclesiastics in some extraordinary Cases. The insatiable Avarice of the *Roman* Clergy, the mean and scandalous Arts they were daily practising to circumvent the Orphans, plunder the Widows, and rob the lawful Heirs of their just Inheritance, cried loudly for a Reform; but were Evils too strong for the Curb of Exhortation, Admonition, or Censures merely ecclesiastical; and *Damasus* himself was not quite free from Imputations of this Nature. It was therefore necessary, that the Secular Power should interpose in Defence of the deluded Laity, against the Craft and Rapines of the ravenous Clergy. A Law was accordingly enacted by the Emperor *Valentinian*, in the Year 370. addressed to *Damasus* Bishop of *Rome*, and read, on the 29th of *July*, in all the Churches of that City, strictly forbidding the Ecclesiastics, and such of them as professed Celibacy, meaning the Monks, to frequent the Houses of Orphans or Widows, or to accept from those, whom they attended under the Veil of Religion, any thing whatsoever by way of Donation, Legacy, or Feoffment in Trust. Whatever was thus given or accepted, is declared forfeited to the public Treasury [m].

Law enacted by him.

[l] Id. ib. p. 931—941.

[m] Cod. Theod. 16. t. 2. l. 20. p. 48.

This

This Law, taken in a literal Senſe, only forbids the Eccleſiaſtics to accept of ſuch Donations as were made by the Women whom they attended in ſpiritual Matters as their Guides or Directors; but it was either underſtood and interpreted as extending to all Donations from pious Perſons, or a new Law was made at this Time excluding the Eccleſiaſtics from all ſuch Donations, as plainly appears from *Jerom* and *Ambroſe*, of whom the former, in one of his Letters, writes thus: *I am aſhamed to ſay it, the Prieſts of the Idols, the Stage-Players, Charioteers, Whores, are capable of inheriting Eſtates, and receiving Legacies; from this common Privilege, Clerks alone, and Monks, are debarred by Law; debarred, not under perſecuting Tyrants, but Chriſtian Princes* [n]. And *Ambroſe*; *We are excluded by Laws, lately enacted, from all Inheritances, Donations, and Legacies; yet we do not complain: And why ſhould we? By ſuch Laws we only loſe Wealth; and the Loſs of Wealth is no Loſs to us. Eſtates are lawfully bequeathed to the Miniſters of the Heathen Temples; no Layman is excluded, let his Condition be ever ſo low, let his Life be ever ſo ſcandalous: Clerks alone are debarred of a Right common to the reſt of Mankind. Let a Chriſtian Widow bequeath her whole Eſtate to a Pagan Prieſt, her Will is good in Law; let her bequeath the leaſt Share of it to a Miniſter of God, her Will is null. I do not mention theſe Things by way of Complaint, but only to let the World know that I do not complain; for I had rather we ſhould want Money, than Virtue or Grace* [o]. From theſe Teſtimonies it is manifeſt, that either by the above-mentioned Law, or by ſome other publiſhed at this Time, the Eccleſiaſtics were reſtrained from receiving any Donations or Legacies whatever, by whomſoever bequeathed: and that ſuch a Law was abſolutely neceſſary, is no leſs manifeſt from the unqueſtionable Authority of *Jerom*, who lived at this very Time in *Rome*, and deſcribes as an Eye-witneſs the Arts that were practiſed with great Succeſs by the *Roman* Clergy to circumvent rich Widows, and old Men. *The Clerks*, ſays he, *who ought to inſtruct and awe the Women with a grave and compoſed Behaviour, firſt kiſs their Heads, and then, ſtretching out their Hand, as it were to beſtow a Bleſſing, ſlyly receive a Fee for their Salutation. The Women in the mean time, elated with Pride in ſeeing themſelves thus courted by the Clergy, prefer the Freedom of Widowhood to the Subjection attend-*

The Sentiments of S. Jerom and Ambroſe concerning this Law.

[n] Hier. ep. 2. p. 13. [o] Amb. ep. 12. t. 5. p. 200.

ing

ing the State of Matrimony. Some of the Clergy make it the whole Business and Employment of their Lives to learn the Names of the Ladies, to find out their Habitations, to study their Humour. One of these (perhaps *Antimus* or *Sophronius*, two Monkish Harpyes, of whom he speaks elsewhere), *an Adept in the Art, rises with the Sun, settles the Order of his Visits, acquaints himself with the shortest Ways, and almost breaks into the Rooms of the Women before they are awake. If he sees any curious Piece of Houshold Furniture, he extols, admires, and handles it; and, sighing that he too should stand in need of such Trifles, in the End, rather extorts it by Force, than obtains it by Good-will, the Ladies being afraid to disoblige the prating old Fellow, that is always running about from House to House* p. The same Writer, speaking elsewhere of the Monks, displays the Arts which they practised to deceive, captivate, and plunder, the rich Widows, and old Men; and adds, that, by professing Poverty, they were become rich, and that the Church grieved to see many acquire great Wealth by serving her, who had been Beggars, while they lived in the World q. So that the Monastic Profession was in those early Times what it is now, a gainful Trade, under the Mask of Religion. As for the mean, nay, and nauseous Offices, to which they were prompted by their Avarice, and the greedy Expectation of Legacies, to submit, about the childless old Men and Women in their Sickness, it would be forgetting the Dignity of an Historian to mention them. The Reader will find them described by *Jerom*, and perhaps too minutely, in the Letter he wrote to his Friend *Nepotian* r. In the same Letter he informs us, how the Wealth thus acquired, was disposed of. *I*, says he, applying to himself what he levelled at others, to render the Truth he spoke less disagreeable; *I, who was born in a poor Country Cottage, who had scarce Millet enough, and coarse Bread, to satiate my craving Stomach, now despise the finest Flour, the choicest Honey, am well acquainted with the different Kinds and Names of Fishes, and can tell by the Taste from what Coast each Shell-fish was brought, from what Province each Bird* s. A Law was therefore necessary to restrain the insatiable Avarice of the *Roman* Clergy, and obviate the unhallowed Use they made of the Wealth, which by such scandalous Means they had acquired. This Law *Jerom* calls a Caustic; and adds, that he does not complain of it, but of the Sore that required it t. However, that he complains,

p Hier. ep. 22. q Id. ep. 3. r Id. ep. 2. s Id. ib. t Id. ib.

and

and *Ambroſe* too, not only of the Sore, but the Cauſtic, is manifeſt from their Words, and Manner of writing. To exaggerate the pretended Hardſhip, they both obſerve, that the Pagan Prieſts lay under no ſuch Reſtraints: An unſeaſonable Obſervation! ſince it ſhews the Difference between the Pagan and Chriſtian Prieſthood in a mortifying Light. The former gave no Occaſion to ſuch a Law, their Avarice wanted no ſuch Reſtraints; if it had, we may be ſure they had met with no Quarter from a Chriſtian, nay, from an orthodox, Prince; and if he had ſpared them, ſuch Partiality had not been tamely put up, and paſſed over in Silence, by the Eccleſiaſtical Writers of thoſe Times, namely, by the Two I have mentioned.

That Law probably not procured by Damaſus.

Baronius is of Opinion, that the above-mentioned Law was procured by *Damaſus*, who, finding his Clergy no longer awed by the ſpiritual Sword, had recourſe to the Temporal; for the Temporal, adds he, though in the Emperor's Hands, was given by our Saviour to St. *Peter* and his Succeſſors, as well as the Spiritual [u]. Thus he puts at once both Swords into the Pope's Hands, though he has not yet been able to allege one ſingle Inſtance of their having either. They got both, 'tis true, in After-ages; and we ſhall ſee, in the Sequel of this Hiſtory, how they came by them. But that Law, ſays *Baronius*, was read in all the Churches of *Rome*. And ſo have others been, when they concerned the Clergy, and were addreſſed to, though not procured by, the Biſhop of that City [w]. Beſides, as *Damaſus* loved Pomp and Grandeur, it is not at all probable that he was inſtrumental in the enacting of a Law, which deprived him of the main Fund to ſupport them, the Generoſity of the *Roman* Ladies.

It is extended to ſacred Virgins, and to Biſhops.

Two Years after, that is, in 372. the Law I have mentioned above was extended by the ſame Prince, *viz. Valentinian*, to the ſacred Virgins and Biſhops, ſo as to exclude the former from the Right of giving, and the latter from that of receiving any thing whatſoever by way of Donation, Legacy, *&c* [x]. But this Law, with another ſtill more ſevere, publiſhed Twenty Years afterwards by the Emperor *Theodoſius*, was abrogated by the Emperor *Marcian* in the Year 455. as I ſhall have Occaſion to relate hereafter. In the mean time I cannot help obſerving with Aſtoniſhment, how early the primitive Rigour of Diſcipline and Manners was utterly neglected and forgotten by the Eccleſiaſtics of *Rome*; how early the moſt exorbitant Luxury,

The primitive Rigour and Diſcipline utterly neglected at Rome.

[u] Bar. ad ann. 370. n. 118. [w] Vide Cod. Theod. t. 6. p. 50. [x] Cod. Theod. mov. 16. t. 2. l. 22. p. 50.

with all the Vices attending it, was introduced among them, and the most scandalous and unchristian Arts of acquiring Wealth universally practised. They seem to have rivalled, in riotous living, the greatest Epicures of Pagan *Rome*, when Luxury was there at the highest Pitch. For *Jerom*, who was an Eye-witness of what he wrote, reproaches the *Roman* Clergy with the same Excesses, which the Poet *Juvenal* so severely censured in the *Roman* Nobility, under the Reign of *Domitian*. And how much more worthy were the former of the severest Censure, not only in regard of their Calling, and the Religion they professed, teaching them to curb and subdue all irregular Passions and Appetites, but from this aggravating Circumstance, that the Estates they so squandered and wasted were not their own, but the Patrimony of the Poor, the Substance of the Orphans, Widows, and unhappy Persons, whom, under the Cloke of Religion, they robbed of their just Inheritance! And herein they conformed to the Example of their Chief, who, finding an inexhaustible Fund in the Generosity of the *Roman* Ladies to support his Extravagance, lived in that Pomp and Grandeur which *Ammianus* has described above.

The Orthodox persecuted in the East.

But he was roused from the easy and indolent Life he led at *Rome*, by Letters from the famous *Basil*, lately raised to the See of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*, the Metropolis of *Pontus*, imploring his Assistance, and that of the other Western Bishops, in the present unhappy Condition of the Churches in the East. *Arianism* was almost utterly extirpated in the West under the orthodox Emperor *Valentinian*, as I have observed above; but in the East it triumphed under his Brother *Valens*, a most zealous Favourer of the *Arians*, a most implacable Enemy to the Orthodox, who were by him every-where driven from their Sees, and sent into Exile: nay, he gave full Power to the *Arian* Bishops and Magistrates to imprison, fine, beat, rack, and banish, at Pleasure, such of the orthodox Clergy as they could not win over by more gentle Methods. This Power they used so tyrannically, especially at *Constantinople*, that the Clergy of that City resolved to apply to *Valens* himself for Relief, not doubting but the Miseries they groaned under might, if duly represented, even move him to Compassion. Accordingly they appointed Eighty of their Body, all Men of unblemished Characters, and known Piety, to repair to *Nicomedia*, where that Prince then was, and lay their Grievances before him. Upon their Arrival at Court, they were introduced to the Emperor, who heard them with great Attention, without shewing the least Emotion either

of

of Reſentment or Compaſſion. However, as upon his diſmiſſing them he immediately ſent for *Modeſtus* the *Præfectus Prætorio*, they concluded that he had given Ear to their juſt Complaints, and began to expect a ſpeedy Redreſs of their Grievances. But the Charge he gave him, very different from what they expected, was to diſpatch them all without Mercy or Delay. The Prefect, apprehending the Death of ſo many eminent Eccleſiaſtics might occaſion a Tumult in the City, gave out that the Emperor had ordered them into Exile; and accordingly cauſed them to be put on board a Veſſel, in order to be conveyed, as he pretended, to the Place of their Baniſhment. But the Veſſel was no ſooner out of Sight, than the Mariners, purſuant to their private Inſtructions, ſet Fire to it, and, betaking themſelves to their Boat, left thoſe they had on board to the Mercy of the Flames and Waves [y].

Inhumanly treated by the Emperor Valens.

But *Athanaſius*, *Baſil*, and the other Champions of the orthodox Party, were not ſo much alarmed at the cruel Perſecution raiſed againſt them by their Enemies, as at the unhappy Diviſions that reigned at this very Time among themſelves. It was to procure a Remedy for theſe Diviſions, to heal a dangerous Schiſm, that rent the orthodox Party into two oppoſite Factions, that *Baſil*, by the Advice of *Athanaſius*, wrote the above-mentioned Letter to *Damaſus*, and that the orthodox Biſhops of the Eaſt wrote in common a Letter to all their Brethren in the Weſt. As this Schiſm did more Hurt to the orthodox Cauſe than it was in the Power of their Enemies to have done, I ſhall not think it foreign to my Purpoſe to inſert a ſuccinct Account of its Riſe and Progreſs. *Euſtathius*, the orthodox Biſhop of *Antioch*, being depoſed by the *Arians* in 331. and one of their own Party put in his room, the greater Part of the Clergy and People of that City, acknowleging the new-choſen Biſhop, and his *Arian* Succeſſors, aſſiſted at their Aſſemblies, mixed with the *Arians*, and received the Sacraments at their Hands, though they diſagreed with them in Belief. But ſome more zealous than the reſt, refuſing to own any other Biſhop ſo long as *Euſtathius* lived, held their Aſſemblies apart, under the Direction of Presbyters animated with the like Zeal. Theſe, from their ſteady Attachment to *Euſtathius*, were called *Euſtathians*, and with them alone *Athanaſius* communicated while he was at *Antioch* [z]. This Schiſm or Separation continued even after the Death of *Euſtathius*, thoſe of his Party declining not only the

The Orthodox divided among themſelves.

What occaſioned this Diviſion.

[y] Socr. l. 4. c. 15. Soz. l. 6. c. 13. Theod. l. 4. c. 21. Naz. or. 20. [z] Socr. l. 2. c. 45. Theod. l. 2. 27. ep. 73. c. 28. Hier. chron.

Communion of the *Arians* and their Bishops, but of the Orthodox, who communicated with them. In the Year 360. the See of *Antioch* being vacant, by the Translation of *Eudoxius* the *Arian* to that of *Constantinople*, the *Arians*, and the Orthodox, who communicated with them, chose with one Consent the famous *Meletius* to succeed him. Both Parties joyfully concurred in this Election; the Orthodox, because they knew his Doctrine to be no less pure than his Manners; and the *Arians*, because they hoped, by such a distinguishing Mark of their Friendship and Esteem, to win him, and by his Means to gain over to their Party the whole City of *Antioch*, nay, and the *Eustathians* themselves [a]. But they soon found, to their great Mortification, that the Orthodox were better acquainted with *Meletius* than they, that he was most zealously attached to the orthodox Party, and was not to be swayed by Friendship or Enmity, by Hopes or Terrors. He was no sooner installed, which Ceremony was performed with the greatest Solemnity, than he loudly declared in favour of *Consubstantiality*, and boldly cut off from his Communion, as rotten and incurable Members, all who held the opposite Doctrine. The *Arians* of *Antioch* were thunderstruck with the Boldness of the Attempt; the whole Party took the Alarm; *Eudoxius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, and the neighbouring Bishops, forgetful of every thing else, hastened to *Antioch*; Hopes, Fears, Prayers, Menaces, were successively employed, and nothing left unattempted to divert, at least to allay, the impending Storm. But all in vain; the Zeal of *Meletius* was incapable of Controul: he openly declared, that nothing should, nothing could, make him desist from, or relent in, the Work he had undertaken, till he had utterly extirpated the *Arian* Heresy, without leaving the least Shoot of so poisonous a Weed in the Field, which by Divine Appointment he was to guard and cultivate [b]. The *Arians* finding him immovably fixed in his Resolution, and, what doubled their Concern, the whole Party in imminent Danger from one of their own chusing, they applied with better Success to the Emperor *Constantius*; and, charging the new Bishop of *Antioch* with *Sabellianism*, which Charge the credulous and unwary Prince believed upon their Word, they extorted from him a Rescript banishing *Meletius* from *Antioch* about Thirty Days after his Installment, and confining him to *Melitene* in *Armenia*, his native City [c]. *Euzoius* was preferred in his room, formerly

Meletius the new Bishop of Antioch *declares in favour of the Orthodox.*

He is banished.

[a] Soz. l. 4. c. 28. [b] Chrys. or. 45. [c] Chrys. ib. Epiph. c. 38. Soz. l. 4. c. 28. Theod. l. 2. c. 27. Philost. l. 5. c. 5.

the

the chief Favourite of *Arius*, and the moſt antient of all his Diſciples; for together with him he was condemned by the great Council of *Nice*.

The Orthodox, who had hitherto communicated with the *Arians*, were ſo diſobliged and ſcandalized at theſe Proceedings, that, in the End, they renounced the *Arian* Communion; and, aſſembling by themſelves, propoſed an Union with the *Euſtathians*. But their Propoſal was rejected by the leading Men of that Party, alleging, that they could not admit them to their Communion, becauſe they had for ſo many Years communicated with the *Arians*, received the Sacraments at their Hands, and ſtill ſeemed to acknowlege *Meletius* as lawful Biſhop, though he had been choſen by the *Arian* Faction: for the *Euſtathians*, notwithſtanding the heroic Firmneſs of *Meletius* in defending and promoting the common Cauſe, refuſed to own him, for no other Reaſon but becauſe the *Arians* had had a chief Share in his Election [d]. As this Diſagreement greatly weakened the Orthodox Cauſe in *Antioch*, and might, in time, be attended with fatal Conſequences, no Pains were ſpared by the apoſtolic Men of thoſe Times, to induce the *Euſtathians* to abate ſomewhat of their Zeal and Severity. As for the other Party, notwithſtanding their Attachment to *Meletius*, whence they had the Name of *Meletians*, they were greatly inclined to an Accommodation, and ſeemed to court the Communion of the *Euſtathians*, almoſt upon any Terms. *Lucifer*, the famous Biſhop of *Cagliari*, on his Return from *Thebais* in *Egypt*, to which Place he had been confined by *Conſtantius*, was prompted by his Zeal to take *Antioch* in his Way, with a Deſign to mediate an Accommodation between the diſſenting Parties. Being arrived in that City, he had ſeveral Conferences with the leading Men of the one and the other Party; and, finding neither averſe to an Accommodation, he conceived great Hopes of ſucceeding in his Deſign; and therefore begged the Fathers of the Council of *Alexandria*, which was already ſitting, and to which he had been invited by *Athanaſius*, to diſpenſe with his aſſiſting at that Aſſembly, ſince his Preſence ſeemed more neceſſary at *Antioch*. However, he appointed Two of his Deacons to be preſent as his Deputies, injoining them to agree, in his Name, to the Deciſions of the Council [e]. *Baronius* owns here, which I cannot help obſerving by the way, that *Lucifer* never ap-

Great Diviſions in that Church.

[d] Socr. l. 2. c. 44. Theod. l. 3. c. 12.

[e] Ruf. l. 1. c. 20. Socr. l. 3. c. 6.

peared

peared in the Council of *Alexandria* [f]; forgetting, no doubt, what he elsewhere so strenuously maintains [g]; *viz.* that *Lucifer* assisted at that Assembly, in the Name of Pope *Liberius*, and as his Legate.

The Council of Alexandria *strive to heal these Divisions.*

The Fathers of the Council not only approved of the Bishop of *Cagliari*'s Resolution, but appointed *Eusebius* of *Vercelli*, and *Asterius* of *Petra* in *Arabia*, to assist him in so pious an Undertaking. What seemed chiefly to obstruct the so much wished for Union, was a great Attachment on one Side to *Meletius*, and an equal Obstinacy on the other, in refusing to acknowlege one preferred by the *Arians*. The Confessors therefore assembled in *Alexandria* (for of Confessors alone that Assembly was composed) were of Opinion, that, if every other Remedy proved ineffectual, their Deputies should apply to *Meletius*; and, having persuaded him to resign his Dignity, chuse another in his room, equally acceptable to both Parties. They did not in the least doubt but *Meletius* would readily, nay, with great Joy, sacrifice his Dignity, and every other private View, to the public Tranquillity [h]; so great was the Opinion they entertained of his Virtue. Had this wise Resolution taken place, it had, in all Likelihood, been attended with the desired Effect. But before the Deputies could reach *Antioch*, *Lucifer*, more commendable for Zeal than Prudence,

All Means of an Accommodation cut off by the imprudent Conduct of the Bishop of Cagliari.

had cut off all means of an Accommodation, by conferring, of his own Authority, the Episcopal Dignity on the Presbyter *Paulinus*, who was at the Head of the *Eustathians*, and had with more Warmth than any other opposed *Meletius*, and those who adhered to him. He was assisted in that irregular Ordination by Two other Confessors [i]; *viz.* *Gorgonius* of *Germanicia*, and *Cymatius* of *Gabala*, or rather of *Paltos* [k]. This Step he took to oblige the *Eustathians*, when he found that they could by no means be induced to acknowlege *Meletius*. But, instead of closing, he thereby widened, the Breach, the *Meletians* declaring, that they would never abandon a Bishop of their own Party, to acknowlege one of another, chosen without their Consent, or even their Knowlege [l]. This unhappy Division, thus settled and confirmed between the Two Orthodox Parties in *Antioch*, did not continue long confined to that particular Church, but soon extended to the Church universal; some owning *Meletius* for lawful Bishop of *Antioch*, and others *Paulinus*. *Athanasius* communicated with *Pauli-*

[f] Bar. ad ann. 362. n. 180. [g] Id. ib. n. 206. [h] Athan. de Ant. p. 574—577. [i] Hier. chron. [k] Ath. ep. ad Solit. & de Antioch. Eccl. p. 580. [l] Ruf. l. 1. c. 27. Theod. l. 3. c. 2.

nus,

nus, and not with *Meletius*; and his Example was followed by the Biſhops of *Egypt*, of *Cyprus*, and all the Biſhops in the Weſt [m]. On the other hand, all the Orthodox Biſhops in the Eaſt, except *Athanaſius*, and thoſe I have mentioned, eſpouſed, with great Warmth, the Cauſe of *Meletius* [n]. They all continued, however, notwithſtanding this Diſagreement, to communicate with each other, though with ſome Indifference and Coldneſs. The Ordination of *Paulinus* gave Riſe to another Schiſm; for *Euſebius* of *Vercelli*, finding, on his Arrival at *Antioch*, all Hopes of an Accommodation cut off, and no Room left for the Meaſures concerted and agreed to by the Council, immediately quitted the City, without communicating with either Party. This was condemning the Conduct of *Lucifer*; which he could not brook; and therefore, full of Reſentment, he renounced the Communion of *Euſebius*, with whom he had hitherto lived in the greateſt Intimacy, and ſuffered together with him a moſt painful Exile for the common Cauſe [o].

Baſil Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, one of the great Lights of the Church, left nothing unattempted, which he apprehended could any-ways contribute to the reuniting of the Orthodox among themſelves, and putting an End to the preſent Schiſm. But, deſpairing at laſt of Succeſs, and finding the Prelates in the Eaſt all warmly engaged in the Diſpute, ſome in favour of *Meletius*, and ſome of *Paulinus*, he reſolved to apply to the Biſhop of *Rome*, who had not yet declared for either of the Competitors, his Thoughts being wholly employed in ſecuring his Dignity againſt a Competitor at Home. He wrote therefore to *Damaſus*, intreating him to diſpatch Deputies into the Eaſt, who, in Concert with the Prelates there, inclined to an Accommodation, might ſettle the proper Means of accompliſhing ſo deſirable a Work, and uniting in Charity thoſe, who were already united in Faith. He added, that it was from his Zeal alone they expected Relief, from that Zeal which he had made ſo eminently appear on other Occaſions; that *Dionyſius*, one of his Predeceſſors, afforded them a ſeaſonable Aſſiſtance, when their Wants were leſs preſſing, and their Condition not ſo deplorable; and therefore that there was no Room left to doubt of his readily conforming to ſo glorious an Example [p]. With this Letter, and another from the Biſhops in the Eaſt, ſoliciting the Advice, Aſſiſtance, and Mediation of

St. Baſil *Biſhop of* Cæſarea *applies to* Damaſus.

[m] Id. ib. c. 30. [n] Id. ib. [o] Id. ib. Theod. l. 3. c. 2. [p] Baſil. ep. 320.

their

their Collegues in the West, *Dorotheus*, Deacon of the Church of *Antioch*, was dispatched into *Italy*: whence he returned in the Beginning of the following Year 372. with an Answer from the Bishops of *Illyricum*, *Italy*, and *Gaul* [q]. But *Damasus* did not condescend to return an Answer to *Basil*, or take the least Notice of his Letter; which haughty Conduct he justly resented, and in pretty sharp Terms, taxing *Damasus*, in one of his Letters [r], with a Spirit of Pride and Vanity, which made him overlook other Bishops as below his Attention, and expect to be accosted by them with the meanest Flattery. But his thus disregarding the Request and Intreaties of the Bishop of *Cæsarea*, was not owing to his Pride alone. He was so little acquainted with the State of the Churches in the East, and what passed there, that he looked upon *Eusebius* Bishop of *Samosata*, and *Meletius*, with whom *Basil* lived in great Intimacy, as rank *Arians*, tho' they both lived at that very time in Exile, having been driven from their Sees by the *Arians*, on account of the Zeal, which they had, with an invincible Firmness, exerted in Defence of the Orthodox Faith [s]. The Bishop of *Rome* might, with very little Trouble, have been better informed; but his Mind, it seems, was so deeply engaged in worldly Affairs, and his Thoughts so taken up with State, Pomp, and Grandeur, that he was never at Leisure to mind those Matters, which justly claimed, and ought to have engrossed, his whole Attention. By him the Western Bishops were led into the same Mistake concerning *Eusebius* and *Meletius*; and hence the Backwardness they shewed to correspond with *Basil*, as if he designed to impose upon them, or was himself imposed upon by others. Of this *Basil* justly complained in a Letter he wrote to *Eusebius* of *Samosata*; *If the Wrath of God*, says he, *is in the End appeased, if Mercy takes place, what other Help do we stand in need of? But, if his Anger continues, what Relief will the Pride of the West afford us? They neither know the Truth, nor can they patiently bear it. They are ever prepossessed with idle Jealousies, ever swayed by groundless Surmises; and therefore act now the same Part they lately acted in the Case of* Marcellinus; *that is, they quarrel with those, who inform them of the Truth, and, being left to themselves, they introduce and establish Heresies. As for my own Part, I had once some Thoughts of writing a private Letter to their Chief* (that is, to *Damasus*), *and, waving all Mention of Church Affairs, only tell him, that they*

The haughty Conduct of Damasus *resented by St.* Basil.

St. Basil *complains of* Damasus, *and the Western Bishops.*

[q] Id. ep. 273. [r] Id. ep. 250. [s] Id. ep. 321.

neither know what paſſes here, nor take the right Method to be informed; and that they ought not to oppreſs thoſe who are already humbled by Affliction, nor miſtake Pride for Dignity, ſince that Sin alone is capable of ſetting a Man at Enmity with God [r]. From theſe Words it is pretty plain, that the Notion of the Pope's Infallibility was not yet broached, or at leaſt was not yet known to *Baſil*. The Biſhop of the Metropolis of the Empire was deſervedly looked upon, in regard of the Dignity of his See, as the Chief and Head of all the Weſtern Biſhops; and to him as ſuch, not as an infallible and unerring Judge, the Eaſtern Biſhops frequently applied in the Diſputes, that happened to ariſe among them; ſo that all we can infer from their applying to him is, that his Authority bore a great Sway; which was owing to the Pre-eminence of his See, and not to any Power or Prerogative peculiar to him, and ſuperior to others.

Damaſus *takes on him the Office of Judge, being only choſen Mediator.*

It was long ere *Damaſus* could be brought to give any Attention to the Affairs of the Eaſt; and when he did, it was only to add Fewel to the Fire, which had lately begun to rage with great Violence. For, looking upon the Office of a bare Mediator, which alone had been offered him, as no-ways ſuitable to his Dignity, he arrogantly aſſumed that of a Judge, and not only acknowleged *Paulinus* for lawful Biſhop of *Antioch*, but, miſled by falſe and groundleſs Reports, declared *Meletius* a Tranſgreſſor of the Canons, an Intruder, a Schiſmatic, and even an Heretic [s]; that *Meletius*, who had ſuffered Exile, and innumerable Hardſhips, in Defence of the Orthodox Faith, who was then revered all over the Eaſt, as a Man of extraordinary Sanctity, and is now honoured by the Church of *Rome* as a Saint of the firſt Claſs. But his thus openly declaring in favour of *Paulinus*, his treating in ſuch a baſe and unworthy manner one of the moſt eminent Prelates in the Eaſt, ſerved only to engage the Followers of *Meletius* more warmly in his Cauſe; and the great *Baſil*, among the reſt, who could not help cenſuring the Conduct of *Damaſus* as raſh, partial, and injudicious: he even repented his having ever applied to him; for, in one of his Letters to *Euſebius* of *Samoſata*, he expreſſes himſelf thus: *The Saying of* Diomedes *occurs to my Mind*; Intreaties are not to be uſed with *Achilles*, he is too haughty [t]; *and truly the more you flatter haughty and inſolent Men, the more haughty and inſolent they become* [u]. As no Regard was had to the

His Conduct condemned by St. Baſil.

[r] Id. ep. 8. [s] Id. ep. 10. [t] Hom. Il. 9. ver. 694. [u] Baſil. ep. 10.

Authority of *Damasus*, and the Western Bishops, who, following his Example, acknowleged *Paulinus*, and not *Meletius*, the Orthodox Bishops in the East not only continued divided among themselves, but a new Division arose between the Western Bishops, and those of the Party of *Meletius*, at the Head of which was *Basil* Bishop of *Cæsarea*. But, of these unhappy Divisions, so far as the Bishops of *Rome* were concerned in them, we shall have Occasion to speak hereafter.

New Disturbances raised in Rome, *by the Partisans of* Ursinus;

Damasus was far more successful in suppressing the Schism of *Ursinus*, which about this time was revived at *Rome*. The Emperor *Valentinian*, some time before, by a Rescript addressed to *Ampelius* Governor, and *Maximinus* Vicar of *Rome*, had allowed *Ursinus*, and the leading Men of his Party, who had been confined with him to *Gaul*, Liberty to live where they pleased, provided they kept out of *Rome*, and the Suburbicarian Provinces [w]. This Indulgence shewn by the Emperor to *Ursinus*, encouraged his Followers in *Rome* to declare openly in his Favour, and even to assemble apart from those who communicated with *Damasus*. But, being therein opposed by the Party of *Damasus* with their usual Violence, new Disturbances arose, and the City was upon the Point of becoming again the Scene of a Civil War. *Simplicius*, then Vicar of *Rome*, at the Request of *Damasus*, gave the Emperor immediate Notice of the approaching Danger; and the Emperor, in Answer to his Letter, sent him a Rescript, commanding *all those who, in Contempt of Religion, held or frequented unlawful Assemblies, to be banished an Hundred Miles from* Rome, *that their Obstinacy might hurt none but themselves* [x]. Thus for the present a Stop was put to the Disorders that had begun to reign in the City.

who are banished.

The Luciferians *persecuted by* Damasus.

The Two Presbyters *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus* pretend, that this Law was levelled at the *Ursinians* alone, but was interpreted by *Damasus*, as comprehending the *Luciferians*, or the Followers of *Lucifer*, Bishop of *Cagliari*, who, refusing to communicate with the Bishops who signed the Confession of *Rimini*, and with all who communicated with them, had separate Assemblies at *Rome*, and even a Bishop of their own, named *Aurelius*. But *Damasus*, say they, using them, in virtue of the above-mentioned Law, with no less Cruelty than he did the *Ursinians*, they thenceforth assembled only in the Night, under a Presbyter, named *Macarius*, of whose Sanctity and

[w] Cod. Theod. 9. t. 29. l. 1. p. 221. [x] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 91.

Auste-

Auſterities they relate wonderful Things. But Night and Darkneſs could not protect them againſt the perſecuting Spirit of *Damaſus*, whoſe Clerks, breaking one Night in upon them, while they were performing Divine Service in a private Houſe, diſperſed the Congregation, ſeized *Macarius*, and dragging him along with them over the ſharp Flints, by which he was cruelly bruiſed, and dangerouſly wounded in the Thigh, they kept him the remaining Part of the Night cloſely confined. Next Morning he was carried before the Judge, who, finding him inflexible in rejecting the Communion of *Damaſus*, condemned him to Exile; but the holy Presbyter, being arrived at *Oſtia*, died there of his Wounds [y]. The ſame Authors add, that *Damaſus* cauſed ſeveral Catholic Presbyters to be ſent into Exile, and ſome Laymen; but that *Aurelius*, the *Luciferian* Biſhop, in ſpite of all his Efforts, continued in *Rome* to the Hour of his Death [z].

Apollinaris *the Hereſiarch. An Account of him.*

About this Time, that is, in the Year 377. a great Council was held at *Rome*, in which the famous *Apollinaris*, Biſhop of *Laodicea* in *Syria*, was condemned and depoſed with his Two Diſciples *Vitalis* and *Timotheus*. *Apollinaris* was a Man of uncommon Parts, great Penetration, univerſal Knowlege, and had at firſt been ſo zealous a Defender of the Orthodox Faith, that he was looked upon by all, particularly by *Epiphanius* and *Athanaſius*, as one of the great Champions of that Cauſe [a], and ranked by *Philoſtorgius* with *Baſil*, and *Gregory Nazianzen* [b]. He contracted a ſtrict Friendſhip with *Athanaſius*, when that Prelate paſſed through *Laodicea* in 349. on his Return to *Egypt*, and ever after maintained a cloſe Correſpondence with him, on which Account he was excommunicated by *Gregory* the *Arian* Biſhop of that City [c]. When the *Arians* began to prevail in the Eaſt, *Apollinaris* was cruelly perſecuted by the Men in Power of that Party, and at laſt driven into Exile [d]. *Baſil* wrote ſeveral Letters to him, and in thoſe he wrote to others, often mentions him as a Perſon for whom he had the greateſt Eſteem [e]. He is ſaid to have excelled in the Knowlege of the Scriptures, which he publicly interpreted at *Antioch*, where he had *Jerom* among the many Diſciples, who flocked from all Parts to hear him [f]. But he was equally verſed in human Learning, eſpecially in Poetry; and his Knowlege in that Branch of Literature proved very uſeful in the Time of the Emperor *Julian*. For that Prince having

[y] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 65—69. [z] Id. ib. [a] Baſil. ep. 293. Epiph. 77. c. 24. Hier. vir. ill. c. 104. [b] Suidas, p. 373. [c] Soz. l. 6. c. 25. [d] Nil. l. 1. ep. 257. [e] Baſil. ep. 82. [f] Hier. ep. 65.

by a Law debarred the Chriſtians from peruſing or ſtudying the Pagan Authors, *Apollinaris*, to ſupply the want of thoſe Writers, compoſed ſeveral Pieces in Imitation of them, and, among the reſt, a Poem compriſing the Hiſtory of the *Jews* to the Time of *Saul*, and divided into Twenty-four Books, which he diſtinguiſhed by ſo many Letters of the *Greek* Alphabet, as *Homer* had done [g]. He likewiſe wrote Comedies, Tragedies, Lyric Verſes, *&c.* imitating *Pindar* in the latter, and *Menander* and *Euripides* in the Two former [h]. *Sozomen* thinks his Compoſitions fell in no reſpect ſhort of the Works of the Antients; who, upon the Whole, ſays he, were far inferior to him, ſince they excelled, each in one Kind only, but he equally in all [i]. The Tragedy, intituled, *Chriſt ſuffering*, which is to be found among the Works of *Gregory Nazianzen*, is by ſome aſcribed to *Apollinaris*; but that Piece does not at all anſwer the great Opinion *Sozomen* ſeems to have entertained of him. His Paraphraſe in Hexameter Verſe on the Pſalms, the only intire Work of his that has reached our Times, is an elegant, exact, and ſublime Tranſlation of them, greatly commended and admired by the beſt Judges [k]. His Poetry proved very ſerviceable to him, when he began to broach his Hereſy; for great Numbers of People, eſpecially Women, embraced his Doctrine, being taken, and in a manner inchanted, with the Sweetneſs of his Verſes; for he compoſed a great many Songs and Odes equally pious and elegant, adapted to all Occaſions, and on all Occaſions ſung with ſuitable Airs by his Followers [l]. To theſe *Gregory Nazianzen* no doubt alludes, where he ſpeaks of the Pſalms of the *Apollinariſts*, to which the Pſalms of *David* had given place; of thoſe ſweet and ſo much admired Verſes, which were looked upon by them as a Third Teſtament [m]. It was chiefly to oppoſe the Progreſs *Apollinaris* made, by the inſinuating Means of his Poetry, that *Gregory Nazianzen* applied himſelf to the ſame Study. About the Year 362. *Apollinaris* was raiſed, in Conſideration of his great Piety and Learning, to the See of *Laodicea* in *Syria*, in which City he was born, according to the moſt probable Opinion, and had ſpent the greater Part of his Life.

The Doctrine held by Apollinaris *and his Diſciples.*

As for the Doctrine held by *Apollinaris*, and his Followers, called from him *Apollinariſts*; they maintained at firſt, that *Chriſt* had human Fleſh, but not a human Soul, the Want of which was ſupplied,

[g] Soz. l. 5. c. 18. [h] Id. ib. [i] Id. ib. [k] Voſſ. poet. Græc. c. 9. p. 76. Baillet. t. 6. p. 453, 455. [l] Soz. l. 6. c. 25. [m] Naz. or. 52. p. 745.

according

according to them, by the Divinity. But being afterwards convinced that ſuch a Doctrine was repugnant to ſeveral plain and expreſs Paſſages of Scripture, they abandoned it in Part; and, diſtinguiſhing, with ſome Philoſophers, the Soul, by which we live, from the Intelligence, by which we reaſon, they allowed the former in our *Saviour*, but denied the latter; the Operations of which, ſaid they, were performed by the Divinity [n]. Thus they allowed him, ſays St. *Auſtin*, the Soul of a Beaſt, but denied him that of a Man [o]. By means of this Doctrine they avoided the Abſurdity with which they reproached the Catholics, admitting in Chriſt, as they falſly imagined, Two oppoſite and diſtinct Natures, without any Union or Subordination between them [p]. The Catholics indeed acknowleged Two diſtinct and complete Natures in Chriſt, but at the ſame time maintained an Union between them, ſuch an Union as was admitted by the *Apollinariſts* between the Fleſh and the Divinity. The latter upbraided the Catholics with adoring a Man, ſtyling them *Anthropolaters*, and the Catholics reproached in their Turn the *Apollinariſts* with adoring the Fleſh, calling them *Sarcolaters* [q]. The *Apollinariſts* diſtinguiſhed themſelves from the Catholics, by cauſing the following Words to be fixed on the Front of their Houſes; *We muſt not adore a Man that bears a God, but a God that bears Fleſh.* The Errors of the *Apollinariſts* were not only concerning the Soul, but likewiſe the Body of our Saviour; for they maintained, that his Body, like other Bodies only in Appearance, was coeval with the Divinity, and of the ſame Subſtance with the eternal Wiſdom [r]. Hence it followed, by a natural Conſequence, that the Body of our Saviour was impaſſible, and immortal; that it was not taken of the Virgin *Mary*; that he was not born of her; that his Birth, Paſſion, Death, and Reſurrection, were mere Illuſions; or elſe, that the Divine Nature was paſſible: both which Abſurdities were admitted by ſome of the Sects into which the *Apollinariſts* were afterwards divided [s].

This Doctrine was firſt heard of in 362. and condemned the ſame Year in the Council of *Alexandria*. In 373. it began to make a great Noiſe in the Church; but it was not known even then by whom it had been broached: for *Apollinaris* was ſo far from owning himſelf

Apollinaris *not known nor ſuſpected to be the Author of the Hereſy he broached.*

[n] Epiph. 77. c. 23. Theod. hær. 4. c. 8. Ath. de incar. p. 615. Nem. l. 1. p. 710. Naz. orat. 46. p. 722. [o] Aug. in Jo. hom. 47. [p] Naz. or. 52. p. 749. [q] Nyſ. in Apol. l. 2. p. 47. Naz. car. 146. [r] Athan. ad Epiph. 582. Aug. perſ. c. 24. & hær. 55. Theod. l. 5. c. 3. Naz. or. 51. [s] Ath. ib. p. 583. Naz. or. 46. Nil. l. 1. ep. 257. Theod. l. 5. c. 3.

the

the Author of those Tenets, that, in one of his Letters to *Serapion* Bishop of *Thmuis* in *Egypt*, which is still extant [t], he expresses, in the strongest Terms, his Approbation of a Letter from *Athanasius* to *Epictetus* Bishop of *Corinth*, confuting the very Errors he held; and at the same time condemns the Folly of those, who maintained the Flesh to be consubstantial to the Divine Nature. In another Letter to the same *Serapion*, he owns the Body of our Saviour to have been taken of the Virgin *Mary*, to have been formed in her Womb, and his Flesh to have been of the same Substance with ours; adding, *And these are Truths not to be called in question* [u]. In a Third Letter he assures *Serapion*, that he has ever denied in his Writings the Flesh of our Saviour to have descended from Heaven, or to be of the same Substance with the Divinity [w]. *Apollinaris*, by thus publicly declaring against the Doctrine, which at the same time he was privately propagating, eluded the Vigilance of *Athanasius* himself, who, in confuting his Errors, never mentions his Name, nor seems to have entertained the least Suspicion of him; nay, he recommended *Timotheus*, a favourite Disciple of his, to *Damasus*, as a Person whose Orthodoxy was not to be questioned; and as such he was received, not only by the Bishop of *Rome*, but by all the Western Bishops, of whom he obtained Letters, on his Return, directed to *Apollinaris*, as to a Bishop of the Catholic Communion [x].

His Errors condemned in a Council at Rome.

In the Year 374. or 375. *Damasus* convened a great Council at *Rome*, in which the Errors of *Apollinaris* were condemned; but neither was he nor any other named as the Broacher or Author of that Doctrine. The very Year that *Damasus* condemned the Doctrine of *Apollinaris*, he was deceived and over-reached by one of the Disciples of that Heresiarch, named *Vitalis*. He was a Presbyter of the Church of *Antioch*, and of the Communion of *Meletius*, by whom he had been ordained; but afterwards, renouncing his Communion, he joined *Apollinaris*, and, being in high Esteem with the People, drew great Numbers over with him to that Side. Of these, called from him *Vitalians*, *Apollinaris* some Years after appointed him Bishop, adding thereby a Fourth Party to the Three that already divided the Church of *Antioch*, *viz.* the *Arians*, *Paulinians*, and *Meletians* [y]. Before he threw off the Mask, and publicly maintained the Tenets of *Apollinaris*, he strove to be admitted with his Followers to the Com-

Damasus *imposed upon by* Vitalis *one of his Disciples.*

[t] Leont. p. 1031. [u] Id. p. 1032. [w] Id. p. 1035. [x] Id. p. 1042.
[y] Epi. 77. c. 20. Theod. l. 5. c. 4. Soz. l. 6. c. 25. Chron. Alex. p. 688.

munion

munion of *Paulinus* of *Antioch*, and of *Damaſus*; and with this View he undertook a Journey to *Rome* in the Year 375. As he had been ſuſpected, and even accuſed, of holding the Doctrine of *Apollinaris*, *Damaſus* required of him, before he admitted him to his Communion, a Confeſſion of his Faith, which he gave under his Hand, but in ſuch Terms as bore a double Meaning. *Damaſus*, however, well ſatisfied with it, gave him a Letter for *Paulinus* of *Antioch*, and ſent him back to be admitted by that Biſhop to the Communion of the Church [z]. But *Damaſus* ſoon after, either upon his own Reflection, or at the Suggeſtion of others, apprehending himſelf impoſed upon, wrote another Letter to *Paulinus*, by the Presbyter *Petronius*, and afterwards a Third, which *Holſtenius* has inſerted at Length in his *Roman Collection* [a]. Together with this Letter *Damaſus* ſent to *Paulinus* a Confeſſion of Faith, drawn up by a Council ſummoned for that Purpoſe, deſiring him to admit none to his Communion, but ſuch as ſhould ſign that Confeſſion, and the Confeſſion of *Nice* [b]. To this Piece the Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon* no doubt allude, in commending *Damaſus* for pointing out, in his Letters to *Paulinus*, the Rules all Catholics ought to be guided by in reaſoning of the Myſtery of the Incarnation [c]. What *Baronius* obſerves here is true, *viz.* that *Vitalis*, by the ſame ambiguous Confeſſion of Faith, impoſed upon *Gregory Nazianzen*, who received the *Apollinariſts* as Brethren, and not as Enemies [d]. He adds, *And no wonder that* Vitalis *impoſed upon* Damaſus, *ſince by the ſame Confeſſion he impoſed upon* Gregory Nazianzen: he ought rather to have ſaid, *No wonder that he impoſed upon* Gregory, *who did not pretend to Infallibility, ſince he impoſed upon* Damaſus, *who was infallible.* As *Vitalis* refuſed to ſign the Confeſſion ſent by *Damaſus*, *Paulinus* would not admit him to his Communion; upon which he pulled off the Mask, publicly renounced the Communion both of *Damaſus* and *Paulinus*, and, bidding Defiance to the Canons, accepted the Title and Dignity of Biſhop of *Antioch*, offered him by *Apollinaris*. At the ſame time that Hereſiarch, finding he could conceal himſelf no longer, openly declared, that he would communicate with none who held, that our Saviour had taken a human Soul, and human Underſtanding: which was ſeparating himſelf from the Communion of the Catholic Church [e].

Apollinaris openly declares againſt the Church.

[z] Epiph. 77. c. 20. Theod. l. 5. c. 4. Naz. or. 52. [a] Vet. Rom. eccleſ. mon. collect. p. 181. [b] Ib. p. 180. & Theod. l. 5. c. 10. [c] Conc. t. 4. p. 826. [d] Naz. or. 51. [e] Theod. l. 5. c. 4. Facund. l. 4. c. 2.

It

It was long before it was believed in the Church that those Tenets had been broached, or were held, by *Apollinaris:* no Credit was given, at first, even to his Disciples, most People being inclined to think, that they were mistaken, and did not comprehend the sublime Thoughts of that great Man [f]. But when no room was left for any further Doubt, the Surprize and Concern of the whole Catholic Party were equal to the high Opinion they had entertained of him till that Time [g]. When *Epiphanius* wrote against the *Apollinarists*, he well knew *Apollinaris* to be the Author of that Sect; for he reproaches him with this unwarrantable Separation from the Church; and yet he speaks of him with the greatest Respect; seems to think, that many Things had been unjustly fathered upon him; and takes a great deal of Pains to assure his Reader, that what he writes is Truth, and not Calumny proceeding from any private Pique, Malice, or Grudge [h].

A great Schism in the Church.

The Schism, which the establishing of a new Bishop occasioned in the Church of *Antioch*, was not confined to that alone, but extended to most other Churches, over which *Apollinaris* appointed Bishops of his own Sect, who held separate Assemblies, practised different Rites, and, instead of the sacred Hymns commonly sung at Divine Service by the rest of the Church, introduced Canticles composed by their Leader, and containing the Substance of his Doctrine [i]. The many perplexed Questions and Difficulties, which he and his Emissaries were daily starting about the Incarnation, bred such Confusion in the Minds of Men, that many began to question the Truth of that Mystery [k]. The Objections they moved against our Saviour's taking Flesh, and being born of the Virgin *Mary*, seemed calculated merely to raise improper Ideas, and sully the Thoughts of chaste Minds; for they themselves held his Body to be coeval with the Divinity, and to have only been conveyed into the World by means of the Virgin *Mary* [l]. Their Doctrine was applauded and received by many, and few who read their Books were content with, or kept to the plain and antient Doctrine of the Church [m]. *Basil* therefore, and the other orthodox Bishops in the East, to put a Stop the more effectually to the growing Evil, not only declaimed against it in all their Writings, but dispatched the Two Presbyters *Dorotheus* and *Sanctissimus* with Letters to *Damasus* and the other Western Bishops, intreating them to condemn

Basil *recurs to the Western Bishops.*

[f] Nil. ep. 257. [g] Basil. ep. 293. Epiph. 77. c. 34. [h] Epiph. 66. c. 20, 77. c. 2. [i] Basil. ep. 293. Soz. l. 6. c. 25. [k] Basil. ib. [l] Naz. or. 46, & 5. Nil. l. 1. ep. 257. [m] Basil. ep. 74.

without Delay the Doctrine of *Apollinaris*, and *Apollinaris* himſelf, ſince he had at laſt openly declared againſt the Church, and owned himſelf the Author of the new Sect [n]. In Compliance with this Requeſt, a great Council was convened at *Rome* the following Year, 378. in which *Apollinaris* was not only condemned with great Solemnity, but depoſed, with his Two favourite Diſciples, *Vitalis* and *Timotheus*; the former Biſhop of the *Apollinariſts* at *Antioch*, and the latter at *Berytus* in *Phœnicia* [o]. By the ſame Council it was deſined, that *Jeſus* was true Man and true God; and whoever maintained or aſſerted any thing to be wanting either to his Humanity or Divinity, was declared an Enemy to the Church [p]. *Vitalis* had deceived *Damaſus*, as I have obſerved above, by a Confeſſion of Faith, in which, under equivocal Terms, he had artfully concealed his Hereſy. The Biſhop of *Rome* therefore, now undeceived, cauſed the Confeſſion he had formerly approved of to be anathematized by the Council, together with its Author, exerting himſelf, ſays *Gregory Nazianzen*, with ſo much the more Vigour againſt them, as they had formerly taken Advantage of his Candour and Sincerity to impoſe upon him [q]. *Gregory Nazianzen* therefore ſuppoſes, that the Pope could be impoſed upon in a Matter concerning the Faith. Indeed the Sticklers for Infallibility muſt either give up that Prerogative, or allow all the Fathers to have talked Nonſenſe.

who condemn the Doctrine of Apollinaris, *and depoſe him with* Vitalis *and* Timotheus.

Baronius is certainly miſtaken, and ſo was *Ruffinus* [r], whom he follows, in aſſerting the Hereſy of *Apollinaris* to have been firſt condemned by the Council of *Rome*, ſince it is manifeſt, that the Doctrine of that Hereſiarch had been condemned long before by *Athanaſius*, *Baſil*, and *Epiphanius*, in their Writings, and by the Council held at *Alexandria* in 362. But *Ruffinus* probably meant no more, than that thoſe Errors were firſt condemned by the Council of *Rome*, under the Name, and together with the Perſon, of *Apollinaris*; which is undeniable. I cannot help obſerving here another Miſtake of *Baronius*, pretending that *Damaſus* (for whatever was done by the Council is by him aſcribed to *Damaſus* alone) in condemning *Apollinaris*, condemned all the Errors he held; and conſequently the Opinion of the *Millenarians*, holding that *Chriſt* was to return upon the Earth, and reign over the Faithful a Thouſand Years before the End of the World.

A Miſtake of Baronius.

Another Miſtake of the ſame Writer.

[n] Id. ep. 74. [o] Ruff. l. 2. c. 20. Soz. l. 6. c. 25. [p] Ruff. ib. Theod. p. 719. Concil. t. 5. p. 741. Leon. Sulp. p. 1042. Phot. p. 231. [q] Greg. Naz. or. 52. [r] Ruff. ib.

The Doctrine of the Millenarians *held by the greatest Men in the Church.*

This Opinion was first broached about the Year 118. by *Papias* Bishop of *Hierapolis*, a Man of great Piety, and honoured by the Church of *Rome* as a Saint [s]. He declares, in the few Fragments of his Works, which have been conveyed to us by *Eusebius* [t], that, as he lived near the Times of the Apostles, he made it his chief Business to learn of their Disciples whatever they could recollect to have been done or said by them, on different Occasions, that was not recorded in Holy Writ. Thus he learned the above-mentioned Doctrine [u], which, upon the Authority of such a Tradition, countenanced by some Passages in the *Revelations* [w], and one Text in St. *Paul*, was embraced and held by the most eminent Men for Piety and Learning, at that time, in the Church; and, among the rest, by *Irenæus*, and *Justin* the Martyr. And yet such a Doctrine is now rank Heresy in the Church of *Rome*. But, by declaring it such, have they not overset their own System, which places Tradition upon a Level with the Canonical Books of the Scripture? Can they allege a more antient Tradition, one more universally received, or equally countenanced by Scripture, in favour of the many traditional Articles of Faith, which they have obtruded upon the World? *Papias* declares, he received the above-mentioned Doctrine of those who had learned it immediately of the Apostles. If such a Tradition be rejected as false, what other has a Right to be admitted as true? If we deny or question St. *Peter*'s having been at *Rome*, Tradition, and the Authority of *Irenæus* (for all the others have copied from him), are immediately produced against us. But what Weight either ought to bear, the Case before us sufficiently demonstrates.

How little Tradition to be depended upon.

To return to *Apollinaris*: It is very certain, that he held and taught the Doctrine of the *Millenarians*; but it is no less certain, that such Doctrine was not condemned, as *Baronius* pretends [x], by the Council of *Rome* in 378. since many eminent Men in the Church held it, and *Sulpitius Severus* among the rest, after that Council, without being deemed Heretics on that score. The Sentence, pronounced against *Apollinaris*, and his Disciples, by the Council of *Rome*, was confirmed by a Council held the same Year at *Alexandria* [y], by an Oecumenical Council assembled at *Constantinople* in 381. and by the Council of *Antioch* in 379 [z]. However, the *Apollinarists*, though

The Apollinarists *condemned by several Councils.*

[s] Martyrol. Rom. 22 Febr. [t] Euseb. l. 3. c. 33. [u] Id. ib. [w] Revel. c. xx.
[x] Bar. ad ann. 118. n. 2. & 373. n. 14. [y] Ruf. l. 2. c. 20. [z] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 99. Prædestinat. de hæres. c. 55.

thus

thus condemned and depoſed by all the Councils of the Eaſt and Weſt, as we read in *Gregory Nazianzen* [a], ſtill kept their Ground, till Recourſe was had to the Secular Power. For the Emperor *Theodoſius*, at the Requeſt of *Nectarius*, Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, enacted a Law, dated the Tenth of *March* 388. forbidding the *Apollinariſts* to hold Aſſemblies, to have any Eccleſiaſtics or Biſhops, or to dwell in the Cities [b]. As this Law was executed with the utmoſt Rigour, at leaſt againſt the leading Men of the Party, who were baniſhed the Cities, and confined to the Deſerts [c], the *Apollinariſts* were in a few Years reduced to a very ſmall Number, when they begged to be admitted to the Communion of the Catholic Church, which was in the end granted them by *Theodotus* [d], who governed the Church of *Antioch*, from the Year 416. to 428. But as their Converſion was owing not to Conviction, but Perſecution, they ſtill held in their Hearts the ſame Sentiments, which ever muſt happen in the like Caſe; nay, and privately inſtilled their Errors into the Minds of many, whoſe Faith had been, till that time, untainted [e]. It was to theſe pretended Catholics, or diſguiſed *Apollinariſts*, that the *Eutychian* Hereſy, and that of the *Monothelites*, of whom I ſhall ſpeak hereafter, owed their Birth [f]. Hence the Emperor *Marcian*, by an Edict in 455. declared the *Eutychians* to be *Apollinariſts*, and conſequently liable to the ſame Penalties [g]. As for *Apollinaris* himſelf, he died about the Year 392. having maintained, to the Hour of his Death, the ſame Sentiments, in which he had lived; and, with them, the ſame outward Appearance, at leaſt, of a moſt holy and exemplary Life [h]; which is all the Authors of thoſe Times will allow him.

Penal Laws enacted againſt them.

While *Damaſus*, and the other Weſtern Biſhops, were wholly intent upon ſuppreſſing the Hereſy of *Apollinaris*, and reſtoring the Eaſtern Churches to their former Tranquillity, the Antipope *Urſinus*, laying hold of that Opportunity, arrived privately at *Milan*, and there joined the *Arians*, upon their promiſing to ſupport him with the whole Power of their Party [i]. But *Ambroſe*, who then governed that Church, and kept a watchful Eye over the Flock committed to his Care, gave immediate Notice of their clandeſtine Meetings, and pernicious Deſigns, to the Emperor *Gratian*, who ſoon after ordered *Ur-*

New Diſturbances raiſed by Urſinus.

[a] Naz. ep. 77. [b] Cod. Theod. 16. t. 5. l. 14. p. 130. [c] Soz. l. 6. c. 26. [d] Theod. l. 5. c. 3. [e] Id. ib. [f] Leo, ep. 134. c. 2. Pet. dog. t. 4. p. 24. [g] Conc. t. 4. p. 886, 887. [h] Hier. vir. ill. c. 104. Nil. l. 1. ep. 257. Greg. Nyſſ. in Ephr. t. 3. p. 609. [i] Amb. ep. 4.

sinus to quit *Italy*, and confined him to *Cologne* [k]. During his Exile his Partisans were not idle; they found the Emperor *Gratian*, who, in 375. had succeeded his Father *Valentinian* I. warmly engaged in favour of *Damasus*: they well knew, that so long as he continued in that Disposition, it would be in vain to solicit the Return of *Ursinus*, or to put up any Petition in his Behalf. In order therefore to estrange the Mind of the Emperor from *Damasus*, they suborned a *Jew*, named *Isaac*, who had embraced the Christian Religion, but was then returned to Judaism, to accuse him before the Civil Magistrate of an heinous Crime, which I find not specified by any of the Antients. But the Emperor, taking upon himself the judging of that Cause, soon discovered the Innocence of the Accused, and the Malice of the Accuser; and therefore, honourably acquitting the former, and punishing the latter according to his Deserts, confined him to a Corner of *Spain* [l].

Damasus *falsly accused, but cleared by the Emperor.*

This Attempt on the Reputation of *Damasus* was not the only thing that gave him great Uneasiness at this time. The Emperor *Valentinian* had transferred, as I have related above, the Power of judging Bishops, such at least as were concerned in the Schism of *Ursinus*, from the Civil Magistrate to the Bishop of *Rome*. But several Bishops, though deposed by him, still maintained themselves in their Sees, with open Force, in Defiance of his Sentence, and the Imperial Law. Among these were the Bishop of *Parma*, and *Florentius* Bishop of *Puzzuolo*, who, for their Attachment to *Ursinus*, had been both deposed by *Damasus*, and other Bishops assembled at *Rome* [m]. The *Donatists* too, notwithstanding the severe Laws enacted against them by several Emperors, had got footing in *Italy*, and in *Rome* itself, where they were known by the Names of *Montenenses*, and *Rupenses*, on account of their assembling in a Church or Oratory, which they had among the neighbouring Rocks and Mountains [n]. They had a Bishop of their own, either sent from *Africa*, or ordained by Bishops sent from thence for that Purpose. *Claudian*, who governed them at this time, was their Fifth Bishop of *Rome* [o]. The Emperor ordered him to be sent back to *Africa*, whence he came. But though he had been several times imprisoned, in order to oblige him by that means to return, he could not even

Some Bishops deposed by Damasus, *keep their Sees.*

[k] Cod. Theod. ap. 82. 92. [l] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 84—92. [m] Ib. p. 82—93. [n] Opt. l. 2. p. 49. Aug. de Unit. c. 3. t. 7. & ep. 165. Hier. chr. [o] Opt. l. 2. p. 49.

so

ſo be prevailed upon to abandon his; Flock but continued at *Rome*, perverting many there, and rebaptizing all he could pervert p. To put a Stop to theſe Evils, the Biſhops of *Italy*, aſſembling at *Rome*, had recourſe to the Emperor *Gratian*, acquainting him with the Conduct of the contumacious Biſhops, and earneſtly intreating him to cauſe the Law, commanding the Biſhops to be judged by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and not by the Civil Magiſtrate, which he himſelf had enacted with his Father, to be put in Execution. By that Law the Emperor, in all Likelihood, only intended to confirm, with reſpect to the Biſhop of *Rome*, the Canons of the Church, appointing the Metropolitan, with his Council, Judge of the Biſhops of his Province in Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes. But the Biſhops, aſſembled on this Occaſion at *Rome*, attempted to extend the Authority of the Biſhop of *Rome*, far beyond the Bounds to which the Emperors and Canons had confined it. For, in their Letter to *Gratian*, they ſuggeſted the following Regulations as neceſſary for the Tranquillity of the Church, and intreated him to eſtabliſh them by Law: 1. That if any, who had been condemned by the Biſhop of *Rome*, or other Catholic Biſhops, ſhould, after ſuch Condemnation, preſume to keep their Churches, they ſhould be baniſhed from the Territories of the Cities, where they had been Biſhops. 2. That ſuch as ſhould refuſe, when lawfully ſummoned, to appear before the Biſhops, ſhould be obliged, by the Prefect of *Italy*, or his Vicar, to repair to *Rome*, to be judged there. 3. That, if the accuſed Biſhop reſided in a diſtant Province, he ſhould be obliged, by the Judges of the Place, to appear before his Metropolitan; and, if his Metropolitan was ſuſpected as partial, or prejudiced againſt him, he might be allowed to appeal to the Biſhop of *Rome*, or to a Council of Fifteen neighbouring Biſhops; but, if the Accuſed was himſelf a Metropolitan, he ſhould either repair to *Rome*, or appear before ſuch Judges as the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhould appoint; and, when thus condemned, acquieſce to the Sentence q. In Behalf of the Biſhop of *Rome* in particular they begged, in the ſame Letter, that, as he *was above other Biſhops, by the Prerogative of the Apoſtolic See, though upon a Level with them as to the Miniſtry*, he might not be obliged to appear before the Civil Magiſtrate, ſince other Biſhops had been exempted from their Juriſdiction, but before a Council; or that the Emperor would reſerve to himſelf the Cogniſance of what concerned him, leaving to the ordinary Judges the

The Italian *Biſhops recur to the Emperor.*

Their Letter to him.

What they demand in particular for the Biſhop of Rome.

p Cod. Theod. ap. p. 83, 84. q Ibid. p. 85—87.

Power

Power of examining Facts and Witnesses, but not the Authority of pronouncing Sentence [r]. What Answer the Emperor returned to the Council, we know not; but, in a Rescript, addressed to the Vicar *Aquilinus*, after summing up the Heads of the Letter from the Council, and severely reprimanding his Officers for their Neglect, in not causing the Imperial Law to be put in Execution, he confirms the Rescript addressed to *Simplicius*, which I have mentioned above; commands the Bishop of *Parma*, *Florentius* of *Puzzuolo*, and *Claudian* the *Donatist*, with all those who shall be condemned by the Councils, as Disturbers of the Quiet of the Church, to be driven from their Dioceses, and banished an Hundred Miles from *Rome:* he grants all the Council had desired, with respect to the judging of Bishops; but requires the Bishop of *Rome* to act with the Advice or Five or Seven other Bishops; and, lastly, he forbids Persons of infamous Characters, or known Slanderers, to be admitted as Informers, or Witnesses against Bishops [s]. In this Rescript he takes no notice of what the Council had asked for the Bishop of *Rome* in particular.

The Emperor's Answer.

From these Pieces, which are still extant, it is manifest beyond all Dispute, as the Reader must have observed, that, in the Year 378. when this Council was held, no Prerogative was yet discovered in the Pope, peculiar to him, and not common to all Bishops, besides that of Rank, which arose from the Dignity of his See, that is, from his being Bishop of the Metropolis of the Empire; for, in that respect alone, the Bishops, who composed the Council, acknowleged him *to be above them*; nay, by declaring themselves, in express Terms, *equal to him as to the Ministry*, they seem to have taken particular Care, that no Room or Pretence should be left for his claiming a Superiority in any other respect. And how great would their Surprize have been, had *Damasus*, in hearing that Part of their Address to the Emperor, started up, and, protesting against it, as derogatory to his Prerogative, declared, that, *to him all Power was given in Heaven and on Earth*; that, *so far from being equal to him, they, and all other Bishops, were but his Deputies and Delegates*; that *the Power, Authority, and Jurisdiction, which they enjoyed, were derived to them from the Plenitude of his!* Had he talked in this Strain, the whole Council would have concluded him delirious. And yet these are the Sentiments of his Successors; these the very Words, with

In what Sense the Pope above other Bishops.

[r] Ibid. p. 87—89. [s] Ibid. p. 90, 91.

which they and their Divines have expreſſed them [t]; ſo that it is now reckoned Hereſy not to believe what in the Fourth Century it had been deemed Madneſs to have gravely uttered. It would perhaps have ſeemed ſtill more ſtrange and ſurpriſing to the Fathers of the Council, however prejudiced in his Favour, if *Damaſus*, inſtead of gratefully acknowleging their Regard for him in petitioning the Emperor, that he might not be judged by the Civil Magiſtrate, but either by a Council, or the Emperor himſelf, had ſeverely rebuked them as Strangers to, or Betrayers of, his inherent Right, acquainting them, that, in virtue thereof, *all Men were to be judged by him, but himſelf by no Man* [u]; that *the greateſt Monarchs were his Slaves and Vaſſals, and he King of Kings, Monarch of the World, ſole Lord and Governor both in Spirituals and Temporals* [w]; that *he was appointed Prince over all Nations and Kingdoms* [x]; that *his Power excelled all Powers* [y]; that *it was neceſſary to Salvation for every human Creature to be ſubject to him* [z]. And yet theſe are the Notions, that have been uttered by his Succeſſors, and the very Terms in which they were uttered. In the Age I am now writing of, they had been looked upon no otherwiſe than the Ravings of a diſtempered Brain; but they are now held by the Church of *Rome*, and her Divines, as Oracles, and inſerted as ſuch into her Canons. *Bellarmine* owns, that, in the Fourth Century, the Pope was ſtill ſubject to the Emperors, nay, and to the Civil Magiſtrate, without the leaſt Diſtinction between him and other Vaſſals. *But this Subjection*, ſays he, in his Apology againſt King *James* [a], *the Emperors exacted by Force, becauſe the Power of the Pope was not known to them.* Nor to any body elſe, he might have added, ſince the Writers of thoſe Times ſeem to have been no better acquainted with the Power of the Pope than the Emperors; at leaſt, they take no Notice of it, even in deſcribing, as ſome of them have done, the State of the Church at the Time they wrote, and relating the Cuſtoms, Laws, and Practices that then obtained. Beſides, how could the Power of the Pope be unknown to the Chriſtian Emperors, if it was one of the chief Tenets of the Chriſtian Doctrine? Neithet *Damaſus*, nor any of his Predeceſſors, can be juſtly charged with Baſhfulneſs, in acquainting the

The Power he now claims unknown in the Time of Damaſus.

[t] Bellar. de ſumm. Pont. l. 4. c. 24. Aug. Triumph. de poteſt. Eccleſ. in præf. ad Joh. xxii. Concil. Later. ſub Leo. X. [u] Grat. diſt. 40. c. 6. [w] Bonif. VIII. in ap. ad Mart. Polon. & Conc. Vienn. p. 909. [x] Pius V. in Bull. apud Camb. ad ann. 1570. [y] Sext. V. in Bull. contr. Hen. Navar. [z] Bonif. VIII. extrav. com. l. 1. tit. 8. c. 1. [a] Bellar. ap. p. 202.

World

World with the Power they had, or claimed. We may further observe here, that the Emperor requires the Bishop of *Rome*, in judging according to the Power granted him, to act with the Advice of Five or Seven other Bishops: a plain Proof that he was as little acquainted with the Pope's Infallibility, as with his Power.

A new Accusation brought against Damasus.

The Council of the *Italian* Bishops, assembled at *Rome*, no sooner broke up, than the Emissaries and Partisans of *Ursinus* began to raise new Disturbances in that City, by stirring up the Pagans against *Damasus*, and, at the same time, charging him *with things*, to use the Expression of the Council of *Aquileia*, *not fit to be uttered by a Bishop, nor heard by such an Emperor as* Gratian [b]. *Anastasius* writes, that he was accused of Adultery by the Two Deacons *Concordus* and *Callistus* [c]. And truly, that some Crime of that Nature was laid to his Charge, is pretty plain, from the Terms in which it was expressed by the Council. *Valerian*, then Governor of *Rome*, immediately acquainted the Emperor with the Accusation [d]; but what Part *Gratian* acted on this Occasion, we are not told by any antient Writer. We read in the Pontificals, and most of the modern Writers, that the Cause was referred by the Emperor to the Council then sitting at *Aquileia*; and that *Damasus* was declared innocent by all the Bishops who composed it. But, as neither is related by any credible Author, I am inclined to believe, that *Gratian* took no Notice of the Charge, in Compliance with the Request of the Bishops assembled at *Aquileia*; for, by a Letter, they earnestly intreated him not to hearken to *Ursinus*, because his giving ear to him would occasion endless Disturbances in *Rome*; and besides, they could by no means communicate with a Man who thus wickedly aspired to a Dignity, to which he had no Claim or Title; who, by his scandalous Behaviour, had incurred the Hatred of all good Christians; who had impiously joined the *Arians*, and, together with them, attempted to disturb the Quiet of the Catholic Church of *Milan* [e].

The Council of Aquileia *writes to the Emperor in his Behalf.*

A great Council assembled at Constantinople, *by the Emperor* Theodosius;

Towards the Latter-end of the Pontificate of *Damasus*, Two great Councils were held, the One at *Constantinople* in 381. and the other at *Rome* in 382. The former was assembled by the Emperor *Theodosius*, who, after having put the Orthodox in Possession of the Churches, which, till his Time had been held by the *Arians* in the East, where he reigned, summoned all the Bishops within his Domi-

[b] Amb. ep. 4. [c] Anast. c. 38. [d] Cod. Theod. ch. p. 104. [e] Amb. ib.

nions

nions to meet at *Conſtantinople*, in order to deliberate about the moſt proper Means of reſtoring an intire Tranquillity to the Church, rent and diſturbed not only by ſeveral Sects of Heretics, but by the Diviſions that reigned among the Orthodox themſelves, by that eſpecially of *Antioch*, the moſt antient of all, which, from that Church, had ſpread all over the Empire, and occaſioned rather an intire Separation, than a Miſunderſtanding between the Eaſt and the Weſt, the former communicating with *Meletius*, and the latter with *Paulinus*, as I have related above. In this Council many weighty Matters were tranſacted, and ſeveral Canons eſtabliſhed, ſome of which, namely, the Second and Third, deſerve to be taken notice of here. For, by the Second, *the Council renewed and confirmed the antient Law of the Church, authorized by the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Canons of the Council of* Nice, commanding the Biſhops of each Province to be ordained by thoſe of the ſame Province, and ſuch of the neighbouring Provinces, as they ſhould think fit to call in; directing all Eccleſiaſtical Matters to be ſettled, all Diſputes to be finally decided by a Council compoſed of the Biſhops of the Province, or at leaſt of the Dioceſe, that is, of all the Provinces under the ſame Vicar; and ſtrictly forbidding the Biſhops of one Dioceſe to concern themſelves, under any Colour or Pretence whatſoever, with what happens in another [f]. By this Canon the Privilege, formerly granted to the See of *Rome* by the Council of *Sardica*, was revoked, and all Appeals from the Council of the Dioceſe forbidden. By the Third Canon the See of *Conſtantinople* is declared firſt in Rank and Dignity after that of *Rome* [g]. Some *Greek* Writers have pretended, that, by this Canon, the Two Sees were declared in every reſpect equal; but That *Zonaras* himſelf owns to be falſe and groundleſs [h]. It is to be obſerved, that the Council of *Conſtantinople* gave Rank and Honour to that See, but no Juriſdiction. It was to the Council of *Chalcedon* that the Biſhops of *Conſtantinople* owed their Authority and Juriſdiction; for by that Council they were impowered to ordain the Metropolitans of the Dioceſes of *Pontus*, *Aſia*, and *Thrace* [i]. The Reaſons alleged by *Baronius* to prove the Third Canon of the Council of *Conſtantinople* ſuppoſititious [k], are quite frivolous; and it is certain beyond all Diſpute, that the Biſhops of that City maintained ever after the Rank,

which revokes the Privilege granted to the See of Rome *by the Council of* Sardica.

[f] Theod. l. 5. c. 9. Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Soz. l. 7. c. 9. Concil. t. 2. p. 947. [g] Concil. ib. [h] Zon. in can. p. 70, 72. [i] Concil. t. 4. p. 795—798. [k] Bar. ad ann. 181. n. 37, 38.

which the above-mentioned Canon had given them. In a short time the Bishop of *Constantinople*, taking Advantage of that Canon, and of the Deference that is naturally paid to the Bishop of the Imperial City, extended his Jurisdiction over all the neighbouring Provinces, nay, and over the whole Eastern Empire, as we shall observe in the Sequel of this History.

The Council writes to the Western Bishops.

The Canons of this Council were, without all doubt, sent, according to Custom, to the Western Bishops for their Approbation, probably with the Letter which the Council wrote to them concerning the Heresy of *Apollinaris* [l]. And yet Pope *Leo* the Great writes, that the Third Canon was never notified to the Church of *Rome* [m]; and *Gregory* the Great, that the Canon condemning the *Eudoxians*, which was the first, had never been received at *Rome* [n]: but *Gregory* perhaps meant nothing else, than that the Canon he mentions was of no Authority at *Rome*. As for *Leo*, it is hard to conceive what he meant by saying, that the Third Canon was not known to the Church of *Rome*; for he could not but know, that the Bishop of *Constantinople* held the Second Rank in the Church, and the First in the East, since his own Legates, whose Conduct he intirely approved of, owned him to have an indisputable Right to that Rank; nay, *Eusebius* Bishop of *Dorylæum* in *Phrygia* maintained, that it was with the Consent and Approbation of *Leo* himself that the See of *Constantinople* enjoyed that Honour.

The Authority of this Council among the Greeks, *and the* Latins.

The Authority of this Council has ever been great among the *Greeks*, who style it an Oecumenical Council, and had often recourse to it as such in the Council of *Chalcedon* [o]. The Bishops of the *Hellespont* speak of it with the greatest Respect and Reverence, in a Letter they wrote to the Emperor *Leo* [p]. As for the *Latins*, I find a great Disagreement among the Popes themselves concerning the Authority of this Council; nay, the greatest of them all disagrees even with himself about it. The Legates of Pope *Leo* rejected its Canons, alleging that they had never been inserted in the Book of the Canons [q]. In like manner the Popes *Simplicius* and *Felix* III. speaking of the Councils which they received, name those only of *Nice*, *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon* [r]. *Gregory* the Great writes, that the Church of *Rome* had neither the Acts nor the Canons of the Council of *Constantinople*;

[l] Concil. t. 4. p. 826. [m] Leo, ep. 53. c. 5. [n] Greg. l. 5. ep. 31. [o] Theod. l. 5. c. 9. [p] Conc. t. 4. p. 945. [q] Conc. t. 4. p. 809. Marca de concord. sacerd. & imp. l. 3. c. 3. [r] Lup. ep. 53. c. 5.

that the Condemnation of the *Macedonians* was the only thing done by that Council which they admitted; and that as to other Hereſies condemned there, they rejected them, as having been condemned before by other Councils [s]. But he declares elſewhere, and often repeats it, that he received the Four Oecumenical Councils, as he did the Four Goſpels [t], naming the Council of *Conſtantinople* in the Second Place. In the ſame Manner, and with the ſame Words, were the Four Oecumenical Councils received by *Gelaſius*, and ſeveral Popes before him, as well as by *Martin* I. and ſeveral others after him: ſo that the Council of *Conſtantinople* is, according to ſome Popes, of equal Authority with the Goſpel; according to others, of no Authority at all: nay, it is thus by the ſame Pope at one time extolled, at another undervalued. Let *Baronius* and *Bellarmine* reconcile theſe Contradictions, if they can.

The Popes at Variance among and with themſelves about it.

That this Council was aſſembled by the Emperor *Theodoſius*, is affirmed by all the Writers who ſpeak of it [u], nay, and by the Biſhops who compoſed it [w]. And yet *Baronius* has the Aſſurance to aſſert, *as a Thing not to be queſtioned*, that it was convened by *Damaſus* [x], whom none of the Antients have ſo much as once named: and this Aſſertion he founds upon the Authority of the univerſally exploded Acts of *Damaſus*; of certain Manuſcripts, which he knows very little of, and nobody elſe, any thing; and of a Paſſage in the Acts of the Sixth Oecumenical Council, where it is ſaid, that *Theodoſius* and *Damaſus* oppoſed with great Firmneſs the *Macedonian* Hereſy; whence the Annaliſt concludes, by what Rules of Logic I leave the Reader to find out, that the Council, which condemned the Hereſy of *Macedonius*, was convened by the Authority of *Damaſus*, backed by that of the Emperor [y]. *Chriſtianus Lupus*, more honeſt than *Baronius*, tho' no leſs attached to the See of *Rome*, ingenuouſly owns, that the Council was aſſembled by the Emperor alone; but adds, that *Damaſus* confirmed it [z]; which is true, if he means no more than that *Damaſus* accepted the Decrees made by the Council; for it was not his, but the Emperor's, Approbation, that gave them a Sanction; and accordingly they wrote, not to him, but to the Emperor, acquainting him, *by whoſe Command they had been called together*, with the Decrees they had made, and requeſting him to confirm them *with his Seal*

This Council was aſſembled by the Emperor, and not by Damaſus.

[s] Greg. l. 6. ep. 31. [t] Id. l. 1. ep. 24. [u] Theod. l. 5. c. 6. Naz. or. 14. Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Soz. l. 7. c. 7. [w] Ep. ſyn. conc. t. 1. p. 872. [x] Bar. ad ann. 381. n. 20. [y] Id. ib. n. 19. [z] Lup. notæ in can. 1, 2. p. 74.

and Sentence [a]. This Council consisted of an Hundred and Fifty Bishops, among whom were Thirty-six *Macedonians*, whom *Theodosius* had particularly summoned, hoping to reunite them with the Catholics [b]. No Mention is made of Letters or Deputies sent either by *Damasus*, or by any of the Western Bishops; and *Theodoret* assures us in Two different Places [c], that *Theodosius* only assembled the Eastern Bishops. *Meletius* of *Antioch* presided; for *Gregory* of *Nyssa* styled him in full Council, *our Father and Head* [d]. Upon his Death (for he died while the Council was sitting) that Honour was conferred on *Gregory Nazianzen*, appointed by the Emperor and the Council Bishop of *Constantinople* [e]; but he resigning, soon after, his new Dignity, his Successor *Nectarius* was named to preside in his room [f].

The Disturbances in the Church of Antioch *increased.*

One of the chief Motives that induced *Theodosius* to assemble so numerous a Council at *Constantinople*, was, to hear what Remedy they could suggest against the Schism of the Church of *Antioch*, which caused such Jealousies between the East and the West as seemed to forebode an imminent Rupture [g]. But before the Fathers of the Council entered upon that important Subject, *Meletius* died; and his Death, which ought to have put an End to the present Disturbances, served only to increase them, and engage the contending Parties more warmly in the Dispute. It had been agreed by *Meletius* and *Paulinus*, that the Survivor should be sole Bishop of all the Orthodox at *Antioch* [h]. *Socrates* and *Sozomen* add [i], that Six Presbyters, who it was most likely might be one Day raised to that See, bound themselves by a solemn Oath not to vote for any other, nor to accept themselves the Episcopal Dignity, so long as either of the Two lived. However, *Meletius* was no sooner dead, than some of the Prelates present at the Council moved for chusing him a Successor, which occasioned many long and warm Debates. *Gregory Nazianzen*, elected Bishop of *Constantinople* a few Days before, exerted all his Eloquence to divert the Council from a Resolution, which, he said, would prove fatal to the Church, and kindle a Flame, which perhaps it might never be in their Power to extinguish [k]. Several other Prelates, Enemies to Strife and Contention, falling in with *Gregory*, spoke to the same Purpose, exhorting their Collegues, with great Zeal and Eloquence, to put an

[a] Vide Bar. ad ann. 181. n. 37. [b] Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Soz. l. 7. c. 7. [c] Theod. l. 5. c. 2. 6. & 7. [d] Nyss. de Mel. p. 587. [e] Id. ib. p. 589. & Naz. car. 1. p. 27, [f] Vide Lup. t. 1. p. 275. [g] Theod. l. 5. c. 6. [h] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 76, 77. [i] Socr. l. 5. c. 5. Soz. l. 7. c. 3. [k] Naz. car. 1. p. 24—26.

End

End at laſt to the unhappy Diviſions that had ſo long rent the Church, by allowing *Paulinus*, already ſtricken in Years, to govern peaceably the remaining Part of his Life [l]. But the far greater Part were for a new Election, offering no other Reaſon to recommend ſuch a Step, but that the Eaſt, where our Saviour had appeared, ought not to yield to the Weſt [m]. So that the Reſolution of giving a Succeſſor to *Meletius* was taken merely out of Pique to the Weſtern Biſhops, who, having the Biſhop of *Rome* at their Head, had begun to treat their Brethren in the Eaſt with great Haughtineſs, and aſſume an Air of Authority that did not become them; but that had been better reſented on any other Occaſion than on this.

Flavianus *ordained Biſhop of* Antioch.

The Reſolution being taken, *Flavianus*, a Presbyter of the Church of *Antioch*, was named by the Council, and, with the Approbation of the Emperor, and of all the *Meletians* at *Antioch*, ordained in that City. He is commended by the Writers who lived in or near thoſe Times, as a Man of an exemplary Life, and extraordinary Piety, as a zealous Defender of the Orthodox Faith, and Oppoſer of the *Arian* Hereſy, as a Mirror of every Sacerdotal Virtue; and, barring the Right of *Paulinus*, the moſt worthy and deſerving Perſon the Council could name to ſucceed the great *Meletius* [n]. Theſe, and other like Encomiums, beſtowed upon *Flavianus* by the Writers of thoſe Times, leave no room to doubt but *Socrates* and *Sozomen* were miſinformed in naming him among the Six Presbyters who took the Oath I have mentioned above; the rather as no notice is taken of ſuch an Oath by his moſt inveterate Enemies, in the many Diſputes that aroſe about his Ordination. *Gregory Nazianzen*, who had been lately preferred to the See of *Conſtantinople*, and had accepted that Dignity with no other View, but to remove all Jealouſies, and reſtore a good Underſtanding between the Eaſt and the Weſt, being ſenſible that the electing of a new Biſhop in the room of *Meletius* would widen the Breach, and obſtruct all poſſible Means of an Accommodation, reſigned his Dignity, and, to the inexpreſſible Grief of his Flock, retired both from the Council and City [o]. In one of his Orations [p], he aſcribes this Reſolution to the Diviſions that reigned among the Biſhops, declaring that he was quite tired with their conſtant quarreling and bickering among themſelves, and comparing them to Children at Play; whom to join in their childiſh Diverſions, would be degrading a ſerious

Greg. Nazianzen *reſigns the Biſhoprick of* Conſtantinople.

[l] Id. ib. [m] Id. ib. p. 27. [n] Vide Theod. l. 5. c. 9. & Cod. Theod. ap. p. 164. [o] Naz. ep. 15. [p] Id. or. 32.

Character.

Nectarius *is chosen in his room.*

Character. Upon the Resignation of *Gregory*, *Nectarius* was chosen to succeed him; but as to the Particulars of his Election they are variously related by Authors, and foreign to my Purpose. He was a Native of *Tarsus* in *Cicilia*, descended of an illustrious and senatorial Family, but at the Time of his Election still a Layman, and Prætor of *Constantinople*; nay, he had not been baptized [q].

The same Year that the Eastern Bishops met at *Constantinople*, by the Command of *Theodosius*, the Western Bishops met at *Aquileia*, by the Command of *Gratian*. While the latter were yet sitting, News was brought of the Death of *Meletius*, and at the same time they received certain Intelligence of the Resolution which the Council of *Constantinople* had taken of appointing him a Successor. Here-

The Council of Aquileia *writes to* Theodosius *in favour of* Paulinus.

upon having dispatched the Business for which they had met, and condemned *Palladius* and *Secundianus*, the only Two *Arian* Bishops now in the West, they dispatched some Presbyters into the East, with a Letter to the Emperor *Theodosius*, wherein, after expressing the Joy it had given them to hear that the Orthodox in those Parts were at last happily delivered from the Oppression of the *Arians*, they complained of the Hardships *Paulinus* had met with, whom they had always acknowleged as lawful Bishop of *Antioch*, put the Emperor in mind of the Agreement between *Paulinus* and *Meletius*, and concluded with intreating him to assemble an Oecumenical Council at *Alexandria*, as the only Means of restoring Tranquillity to the Church, and settling a perfect Harmony amongst her Members [r]. Before this Letter reached the Emperor, the Council of *Constantinople* was concluded, and the Bishops returned to their respective Sees. However, *Theodosius* recalled some of them, in order to govern himself by their Advice in granting or denying the Western Bishops their Request [s]. But the Election of *Flavianus* being in the mean time known in the West, the Bishops of the Vicariate of *Italy*, then assembled in Council with *Ambrose* Bishop of *Milan* at their Head, wrote a long Letter to *Theodosius* complaining of that Election, openly espousing at the same time the Cause of *Maximus* against *Nectarius*, the new Bishop of *Constantinople*, and threatening to separate themselves intirely from the Communion of the Eastern Bishops, unless *Maximus* was acknowleged lawful Bishop of that City, or at least an Oecumenical Council

And the Bishops of Italy *in favour of* Maximus.

[q] Theod. l. 5. c. 8. Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Ruff. l. 2. c. 21. Soz. l. 7. c. 8, & 10. [r] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 75—78. Theodor. l. 5. c. 9. [s] Theodor. l. 5. c. 9.

was

was aſſembled to examine the Claims of the Two Competitors, and to confirm with their joint Suffrages the diſputed Dignity to him, who had the beſt [t]. They alſo deſired, in the ſame Letter, to have the Conteſt between *Paulinus* and *Flavianus* decided.

Who Maximus *was, and how choſen Biſhop of* Conſtantinople.

Maximus, ſurnamed the *Cynic*, becauſe he had from his Youth profeſſed the Philoſophy, and wore the Habit of that Sect, was a Man of a moſt infamous Character, and had been publicly whipt in *Egypt*, his native Country, and confined to the City of *Oaſis*, for Crimes not fit to be mentioned [u]. Being releaſed from his Baniſhment, he wandered all over the Eaſt, and was every-where equally abhorred and deteſted on account of his matchleſs Impudence and ſcandalous Manners [w]. At laſt he repaired to *Conſtantinople*, where he had not been long, when, by one of the boldeſt Attempts mentioned in Hiſtory, he cauſed himſelf to be inſtalled and ordained Biſhop of that City: for the Doors of the Church being broke open in the Dead of the Night, by a Band of *Egyptian* Mariners, he was placed on the Epiſcopal Chair in the profane Dreſs of a *Cynic*, by ſome Biſhops whom his Friends had ſent out of *Egypt* for that Purpoſe. But the People, and ſome of the Clergy, in the adjoining Houſes, being alarmed at the Noiſe, and crouding to ſee what occaſioned it, *Maximus* and his unhallowed Crew thought fit to withdraw, and complete the Ceremony in a Place better adapted to ſuch a Scene of Profaneneſs, the Houſe of a Player on the Flute [x]. *Maximus*, thus ordained, in equal Defiance of the Imperial Laws and Canons of the Church, had the Aſſurance to claim the See of *Conſtantinople* as his Right, and to proteſt againſt the Election of *Gregory Nazianzen*, and likewiſe of *Nectarius*, who was choſen upon the Reſignation of *Gregory*, tho' they had both been named to that Dignity by the Council of *Conſtantinople*, that is, by all the Eaſtern Biſhops. But no Regard being had to his Proteſt, nay, his Ordination being declared null by the Council, and he driven out of the City by the Populace, and rejected with Indignation by the Emperor, he had recourſe to the Biſhops of the Vicariate of *Italy*, then aſſembled in Council with *Ambroſe* Biſhop of *Milan* at their Head, as I have obſerved above. Theſe giving an intire Credit to the Accounts of the lying and deceitful *Cynic*, as they were quite unacquainted with what had paſſed in the Eaſt, not only

[t] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 103—107.
[x] Id. car. 1. p. 14, 15. & or. 28.
[u] Naz. or. 23. & car. 148.
[w] Id. ib.

admitted

He is acknowleged by Ambroſe, *and the* Italian *Biſhops.*

admitted him to their Communion, but, without farther Inquiry or Examination, acknowleged him for lawful Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and wrote the above-mentioned Letter to *Theodoſius* in his Behalf [y]. We muſt not confound this Council with that of *Aquileia*, as I find moſt Writers have done: for the latter was compoſed of almoſt all the Weſtern Biſhops under *Valerian* Biſhop of the Place; whereas the Council I am now ſpeaking of, conſiſted only of the Biſhops of the Vicariate of *Italy*, under the Biſhop of *Milan* their Metropolitan. It is ſurpriſing, that *Ambroſe*, and the other Biſhops of that Council, ſhould not have been better informed with reſpect to the Ordination of *Maximus*, ſince *Acholius* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, with Five other Biſhops of *Macedon*, had, at leaſt a Year before, tranſmitted to *Damaſus* a minute Account of it, agreeing in every Particular with that which I have given above from *Gregory Nazianzen* [z]. The Letter from the Council cauſed no ſmall Surprize in *Theodoſius*: he was ſenſible they had ſuffered themſelves to be groſly impoſed upon; but, not judging it neceſſary to undeceive them, he only told them, in his Anſwer to their Letter, that the Reaſons they alleged did not ſeem ſufficient to him for aſſembling an Oecumenical Council, and giving ſo much Trouble to the Prelates of the Church; that they were not to concern themſelves with what happened in the Eaſt, nor remove the Bounds, that had been wiſely placed by their Forefathers between the Eaſt and the Weſt; and that, as to the Affair of *Maximus*, by eſpouſing his Cauſe they had betrayed either an unwarrantable Animoſity againſt the Orientals, or an inexcuſable Credulity in giving Credit to falſe and groundleſs Reports [a].

The Emperor's Anſwer to their Letter.

A Council of all the Weſtern Biſhops aſſembled at Rome.

Upon the Receipt of this Letter, the *Italian* Biſhops, finding *Theodoſius* no-ways diſpoſed to aſſemble an Oecumenical Council, applied to *Gratian*, who not only granted them Leave to meet at *Rome*, the Place they choſe, but diſpatched Letters to all the Biſhops both in the Eaſt and Weſt, giving them Notice of the Time and Place, in which the Council was to be held, and inviting them to it [b]. But of all the Eaſtern Biſhops, Two only complied with this Invitation; *viz. Epiphanius* Biſhop of *Salamis* in the Iſland of *Cyprus*, and *Paulinus*, whom all the Weſt acknowleged for lawful Biſhop of *Antioch*. The Weſtern Biſhops were all preſent, either in Perſon, or by their

[y] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 104—107. [z] Vide Holſten. coll. vet. Rom. eccleſ. monument. p. 37—40. [a] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 99—101. [b] Hier. ep. 27. Theod. l. 5. c. 9.

Deputies; and *Damaſus* preſided [c]. But, as to the Tranſactions of this great Aſſembly, we are almoſt intirely in the Dark; for all we know of them is, that they unanimouſly agreed not to communicate with *Flavianus*, the new Biſhop of *Antioch*, nor with *Diodorus* of *Tarſus*, or *Acacius* of *Beræa*, who had been chiefly inſtrumental in his Promotion; that they condemned the Hereſy of *Apollinaris*; and that, at the Requeſt of *Damaſus*, a Confeſſion of Faith was drawn up by *Jerom*, and approved by the Council, which the *Apollinariſts* were to ſign, upon their being re-admitted to the Communion of the Church [d]. As for *Maximus*, they ſeem to have abandoned his Cauſe, being, in all Likelihood, undeceived, with reſpect to his Ordination, by *Acolius* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, and St. *Jerom*, who aſſiſted at the Council, and could not be Strangers to the Character of *Maximus*, nor unacquainted with the ſcandalous Methods by which he had attained the Epiſcopal Dignity.

The Miſunderſtanding between the Eaſt and the Weſt increaſed.

The Reſolution they took not to communicate with *Flavianus*, whoſe Election, though imprudently made, was undoubtedly Canonical, and had been approved and confirmed by the Oecumenical Council of *Conſtantinople*, not only increaſed the Jealouſies and Miſunderſtanding between the Eaſt and the Weſt, but occaſioned a great Diſagreement, and endleſs Quarrels, amongſt the Eaſtern Biſhops themſelves. For thoſe, who acknowleged *Paulinus*, *viz.* the Biſhops of *Egypt*, of the Iſland of *Cyprus*, of *Arabia*, inſiſted upon the Depoſition of *Flavianus* [e]. *Neſtorius* mentions ſome Letters, written by the Biſhops of *Egypt*, againſt *Flavianus*, with great Virulency, and a *tyrannical Spirit*, to uſe his Expreſſion [f]. On the other hand, the Biſhops of *Syria*, of *Palæſtine*, of *Phœnicia*, *Armenia*, *Cappadocia*, *Galatia*, *Pontus*, *Aſia*, and *Thrace*, not only maintained, with equal Warmth, the Election of *Flavianus*, but began to treat their Brethren in the Eaſt, who had joined the Weſtern Biſhops againſt them, as Schiſmatics, as Betrayers of their Truſt, as Tranſgreſſors of the Canons of *Nice*, commanding the Elections and Ordinations of each Province to be made and performed by the Biſhops of the ſame Province, and all Diſputes concerning them to be finally decided in the Place where they had begun [g]. This Schiſm occaſioned great

[c] Hier. ep. 16. Theodor. l. 5. c. 9. Ambr. ep. 22. t. 2. p. 37. Ruf. de orig. lib. adulter. p. 197. c. 10. [d] Soz. l. 7. c. 11. Holſt. coll. c. 23.
[e] Theodor. l. 5. c. 23. Socr. l. 5.
[f] Mercat. opera, t. 2. p. 86. n. 5.
[g] Soz. l. 7. c. 11. Theodor. l. 5.

Confuſion in the Church, which continued till the Year 398. when *Chryſoſtom*, after having, with indefatigable Pains, long laboured in vain to bring about an Accommodation between the Eaſt and the Weſt, had at laſt, ſoon after his Promotion to the See of *Conſtantinople*, the Satisfaction of ſeeing his pious Endeavours crowned with Succeſs, as I ſhall relate in a more proper Place.

No Regard paid by the Eaſtern Biſhops to the Judgment of the Pope.

From this whole Account it is manifeſt, as the Reader muſt have obſerved, that the Orientals paid no manner of Regard either to the Judgment of the Biſhop of *Rome*, or to that of the whole Body of the Weſtern Biſhops, aſſembled in Council under him. For though they well knew the Biſhop of *Rome*, and his Collegues in the Weſt, to be warmly engaged in favour of *Paulinus*, yet they refuſed to acknowlege him, even after the Death of *Meletius*; and therefore raiſed *Flavianus* to the See of *Antioch*, in the room of *Meletius*, and confirmed that Election in an Oecumenical Council. The Weſtern Biſhops exclaimed againſt it, deſiring it might be referred to the Deciſion of a General Council. But not even to that Demand would the Orientals agree, thinking, as they declared in their Anſwer, that there was no Occaſion for a Council, ſince *Flavianus* had been choſen and ordained by the Biſhops of the Dioceſe, which was all the Canons of *Nice* required. They therefore exhorted them to diveſt themſelves of all Prejudices, to ſacrifice all private Affections to the Peace and Unity of the Church, and to put an End to the preſent, and prevent all future, Diſputes, by approving, with their joint Suffrages, an Election which had been approved and confirmed by an Oecumenical Council [h].

The Cuſtom of appointing Vicars introduced by Damaſus, *and on what Occaſion.*

To return to *Damaſus:* He was the firſt who introduced the Cuſtom, which his Succeſſors took care to improve, of conferring on certain Biſhops the Title of their Vicars, pretending thereby to impart to them an extraordinary Power, enabling them to perform ſeveral things, which they could not perform in virtue of their own. *Acholius* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* was the firſt who enjoyed this Title, being, by *Damaſus*, appointed his Vicar in *Eaſt Illyricum*, on the following Occaſion: *Illyricum*, compriſing all antient *Greece*, and many Provinces on the *Danube*, whereof *Sirmium* was the Capital, had, ever ſince the Time of *Conſtantine*, belonged to the Weſtern Empire. But, in the Year 379. *Dacia* and *Greece* were, by *Gratian*,

[h] Theodor. l. 5. c. 8.

disjoined

disjoined from the more Weſterly Provinces, and added, in favour of *Theodoſius*, to the Eaſtern Empire, being known by the Name of *Eaſt Illyricum*, whereof *Theſſalonica*, the Metropolis of *Macedon*, was the chief City. The Biſhops of *Rome*, as preſiding in the Metropolis of the Empire, had begun to claim a kind of Juriſdiction, or Inſpection in Eccleſiaſtical Matters, over all the Provinces of the Weſtern Empire; which was the firſt great Step by which they aſcended to the Supremacy they afterwards claimed and eſtabliſhed. This *Damaſus* was unwilling to reſign with reſpect to *Illyricum*, even after that Country was diſmembered from the Weſtern, and added to the Eaſtern Empire. In order therefore to maintain his Claim, he appointed *Acholius* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* to act in his ſtead, veſting in him the Power which he pretended to have over thoſe Provinces. Upon the Death of *Acholius* he conferred the ſame Dignity on his Succeſſor *Anyſius*, as did the following Popes on the ſucceeding Biſhops of *Theſſalonica*, who, by thus ſupporting the Pretenſions of *Rome*, became the firſt Biſhops, and, in a manner, the Patriarchs, of *Eaſt Illyricum*; for they are ſometimes diſtinguiſhed with that Title. This, however, was not done without Oppoſition, the other Metropolitans not readily acknowleging for their Superior one who, till that time, had been their Equal [i]. *Syricius*, who ſucceeded *Damaſus*, inlarging the Power claimed by his Predeceſſor, decreed, that no Biſhop ſhould be ordained in *Eaſt Illyricum* without the Conſent and Approbation of the Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* [k]. But it was ſome time before this Decree took place. Pope *Innocent* I. writes, that his Predeceſſors committed to the Care of *Acholius*, *Achaia*, *Theſſaly*, the Two *Epirus's*, *Candia*, the Two *Dacia's*, *Mœſia*, *Dardania*, and *Prævalitana*, now Part of *Albania*, impowering him to judge and decide the Controverſies that might ariſe there, and appointing him to be *the firſt among the Primates, without prejudicing the Primacy of thoſe Churches* [l]. Thus were the Biſhops of *Theſſalonica* firſt appointed Vicars or Vicegerents of the Biſhops of *Rome*, probably in the Year 382. for in that Year *Acholius* aſſiſted at the Council of *Rome*, and it was, in all Likelihood, on that Occaſion that *Damaſus* veſted him with this new Dignity. The Contrivance of *Damaſus* was notably improved by his Succeſſors, who, in order to extend and inlarge their Authority, conferred the Title of their Vicars, and the

The Biſhop of Theſſalonica *appointed the Pope's Vicar in* Eaſt Illyricum.

The Inſtitution of Vicars improved by the ſucceeding Popes.

[i] Vide Chriſt. Lup. de Rom. Apell. p. 627, 628.
[k] Coll. Rom. Holſten. p. 43.
[l] Ibid. p. 48, 49.

pretended Power annexed to it, on the moſt eminent Prelates of other Provinces and Kingdoms, engaging them thereby to depend upon them, and to promote the Authority of their See, to the utter Suppreſſion of the antient Rights and Liberties both of Biſhops and Synods. This Dignity was for the moſt part annexed to certain Sees, but ſometimes conferred on particular Perſons. Thus was *Auſtin* appointed the Pope's Vicar in *England*, *Boniface* in *Germany*; and both, in virtue of the Power which they pretended to have been imparted to them with that Title, uſurped and exerciſed an Authority above that of Metropolitans. The Inſtitution of Vicars was, by the ſucceeding Popes, improved into that of Legates, or, to uſe *De Marca*'s Expreſſion, the latter Inſtitution was grafted on the former [m].

Legates veſted with greater Power than Vicars.

The Legates were veſted with a far greater Power than the Vicars, or, as Pope *Leo* expreſſes it, *were admitted to a far greater Share of his Care, though not to the Plenitude of his Power* [n]. They were ſent on proper Occaſions into all Countries, and never failed exerting, to the utmoſt Stretch, their boaſted Power, oppreſſing, in virtue of their paramount Authority, the Clergy as well as the People, and extorting from both, large Sums, to ſupport the Pomp and Luxury in which they lived.

The Cuſtom of appointing Vicars and Legates may well be alleged as a remarkable Inſtance of the Craft and Policy of the Popes, ſince, of all the Methods they ever deviſed (and many they have deviſed) to extend and eſtabliſh their Power, none has better anſwered their ambitious Views. But how *Bellarmine* could lay ſo much Streſs upon it as he does [o], to prove, that the Pope has, by *Divine Right*, a ſovereign Authority and Juriſdiction over all the Churches of the Earth, is unconceivable. For it is certain, beyond all Diſpute, that ſuch a Cuſtom had never been heard of till the Time of *Damaſus*, that is, till the Latter-end of the Fourth Century, when it was firſt introduced, upon the diſmembering of *Eaſt Illyricum*, by *Gratian*, from the Weſtern Empire. *Damaſus* did not even then claim that ſovereign and unlimited Power, with which *Bellarmine* is pleaſed to veſt him, but only a kind of Inſpection over the Provinces of the Weſtern Empire, as Biſhop of the firſt See. And here I cannot help obſerving the Diſingenuity of *Bellarmine*, who, in ſpeaking of this Inſtitu-

The ſending Legates no Proof of the Pope's univerſal Juriſdiction.

The Diſingenuity of Bellarmine.

[m] De Marc. concord. ſacerd. & imp. l. 6. c. 5. [n] Leo, ep. 48. [o] Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 20.

tion,

tion, expreſſes himſelf thus: Leo *appointed* Anaſtaſius *Biſhop of* Theſſalonica *his Vicar in the Eaſt, in the ſame manner as the Predeceſſors of* Anaſtaſius *had been Vicars to the Predeceſſors of* Leo [r]. From theſe Words every Reader would naturally conclude, and *Bellarmine* deſigns they ſhould, that the Biſhops of *Theſſalonica* had been the Pope's Vicars from the Beginning, or Time out of Mind; whereas it is certain, that this Inſtitution had taken place but a few Years before. Pope *Leo* I. in conferring on *Anaſtaſius* the *Vicariate Dignity of his See*, as he ſtyles it, declared, that he followed therein the Example of his Predeceſſor *Syricius* [s], *who firſt appointed* Anyſius *to act in his ſtead.* But he was doubly miſtaken; for theſe Vicars were firſt inſtituted, as is notorious, by *Damaſus*, and not by *Syricius*; and it was not by *Syricius*, but by *Damaſus*, that *Anyſius* was veſted with that Dignity [t]. The Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* is ſtyled, by the antient Writers, the Pope's Vicar in *Eaſt Illyricum*, which is manifeſtly confining his Vicariate Juriſdiction to that Diſtrict; but *Bellarmine* extends it at once all over the Eaſt, by diſtinguiſhing him with the Title of *the Pope's Vicar for the Eaſt* [u]. But how little Regard was paid to the Pope's Authority in the Eaſt, I have ſufficiently ſhewn above.

I find nothing elſe in the antient Writers concerning *Damaſus* worthy of notice, beſides his generouſly undertaking the Defence of *Symmachus*, who, being Præfect of *Rome* in 384. the laſt Year of *Damaſus*'s Life, and a *ſworn* Enemy to the Chriſtians, was falſly accuſed to the Emperor, as if he had with great Cruelty perſecuted and oppreſſed them. But *Damaſus* had the Generoſity to take his Part, and clear him, by a Letter he wrote to the Emperor, from that Charge [w]. This was one of the laſt Actions of *Damaſus*'s Life; for he died this Year on the 10th or 11th of *December*, being then in the Eightieth Year of his Age, after he had governed the Church of *Rome* for the Space of Eighteen Years, and about Two Months [x]. He was buried, according to *Anaſtaſius* [y], near his Mother and Siſter, in a Church which he had built at the Catacombs, on the Way to *Ardea*; whence that Place, though Part of the Cœmetery of *Callixtus*, is by ſome called the Cœmetery of *Damaſus* [z]. He propoſed at firſt being buried near the Remains of St. *Sixtus*, and his Companions; but afterwards changed his Mind, leſt he ſhould diſturb the Aſhes of the Saints [a].

Damaſus *dies.*

[r] Id. ib. [s] Coll. Rom. Holſten. p. 145. [t] Ibid. p. 46–49. [u] Bell. ib. [w] Sym. l. 10. ep. 34. [x] Hier. vir. ill. c. 103. [y] Anaſt. c. 38. [z] Aring. l. 3. c. 12. n. 16. [a] Vide Bar. in app. ann. 384. n. 25.

He

He cauſed the Church of St. *Laurence*, near the Theatre of *Pompey*, probably that which his Father and he himſelf had formerly ſerved, to be rebuilt, inlarged, and imbelliſhed; whence it is ſtill known by the joint Titles of St. *Laurence* and *Damaſus* [b]. In that Church his Body is worſhiped to this Day. But how or when it was removed thither, nobody knows [c]. Several Decrees are aſcribed to *Damaſus* by *Gratian*, *Ivo* of *Chartres*, *Anaſtaſius*, and others, but all evidently forged by ſome Impoſtor blindly addicted to the See of *Rome*, and quite unacquainted with the Diſcipline of the Church in the Fourth Century. In one of them a Canon is quoted from the Council of *Nice*, forbidding the Laity to eat or drink of any thing that was *offered to the holy Prieſts*, becauſe none but the *Jewiſh* Prieſts were allowed to eat of the Bread that was offered on the Altar. We know of no ſuch Canon; and beſides, it is not at all probable, that the Council of *Nice* would have reſtrained the Clergy from ſharing at leaſt with the Poor what was offered them. In another of theſe Decrees the Paying of Tythes is commanded, on pain of Excommunication; whereas it might be eaſily made appear, that, in the Fourth Century, the Offerings deſtined for the Maintenance of the Clergy were ſtill voluntary. Another Decree ſuppoſes, that, by an antient Cuſtom, all Metropolitans ſwore Fealty to the Apoſtolic See, and could ordain no Biſhops till they had received the Pall from *Rome*. For the ſake of this, *Baronius* admits all the reſt: but of ſuch a Cuſtom not the leaſt Mention, or diſtant Hint, is to be met with in any antient Writer.

The Decrees aſcribed to him ſuppoſititious.

Damaſus is ranked by *Jerom* [d] among the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, on account of the many ſmall Pieces he wrote, chiefly in Verſe; for he had a particular Genius for Poetry, and was no deſpicable Poet, if ſome Compoſitions aſcribed to him were truly his. He wrote ſeveral Books, both in Proſe and Verſe, in Commendation of Virginity; but neither that, nor any of his other Works, has reached our Times, beſides ſome Letters, and a few Epitaphs, Inſcriptions, and Epigrams, which have been carefully collected by *Baronius* [e], though it may be juſtly queſtioned whether the ſeveral Pieces aſcribed to him by that Writer were written by him. A ſhort Hiſtory of the firſt Popes, ſtyled, *The Pontifical of* Damaſus, and publiſhed together with the Councils, has long paſſed for the Work of *Damaſus*; but now even

His Writings in Proſe and Verſe.

[b] Front. cal. p. 50. Bar. ad ann. 384. n. 16. [c] Aring. l. 3. c. 12. [d] Hier. vir. ill. c. 103. [e] Bar. ad ann. 384. n. 21.

Baronius

Baronius owns it not to be his; and moſt Critics are of Opinion, that it was wrote after the Time of *Gregory the Great*; nay, ſome aſcribe it to *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius*, who flouriſhed in the Ninth Century [f]. As for his Letters, thoſe to *Aurelius* of *Carthage*, to *Stephen*, ſtyled *Archbiſhop of the Council of* Mauritania, to *Proſper* Primate of *Numidia*, to the Biſhops of *Italy*, are all ſpurious, as well as the Letters to which ſome of them are Anſwers, and ſuppoſed to have been forged by that notorious Impoſtor *Iſidorus Mercator* [g]. His genuine Letters are the Two, that are to be found among the Works of *Jerom*, to whom they were written; Two to *Acholius* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, publiſhed by *Holſtenius* in his *Collection of the antient Monuments of the Church of* Rome [h]; a Letter of great Length to *Paulinus* of *Antioch*, whereof the chief Heads are ſet down by *Theodoret* in his Hiſtory, as are likewiſe thoſe of his Letter to the Orientals concerning *Timotheus*, the favourite Diſciple of *Apollinaris*. Several Letters from the Councils, that were held in *Rome* in his Time, and at which he preſided, are ſtill extant, and may well be aſcribed to him. The Two Letters to *Jerom* are well worth peruſing, being written in a pure, eaſy, and elegant Style, and with a great deal of Spirit, Vivacity, and even Gaiety, though *Damaſus* was then much advanced in Years, and overburdened with Cares and Buſineſs [i]. In one of them he declares, that his only Delight was to read the Scriptures, and that all other Books, however well written, gave him rather Diſguſt than Pleaſure. *Jerom* returned to *Rome* from the Eaſt in 382. with *Epiphanius* Biſhop of *Salamis*, and *Paulinus* of *Antioch*, to aſſiſt at the Council held there. The other Two returned to their Sees; but *Jerom* continued at *Rome*, being kept there by *Damaſus*, who employed him in anſwering the Letters he received from the Councils of ſeveral Churches applying to him for his Advice [k]. *Damaſus*, taken with his Learning and Erudition, and chiefly with the Knowlege he had of the Scripture, had long before lived in great Intimacy with him, and upon his leaving *Rome* wrote frequent Letters to him, not thinking it beneath the Rank he held in the Church to conſult him as his Maſter about the true Meaning of ſome difficult Paſſages in holy Writ [l]. Thus in one of his Letters he deſires him to explain the Parable of the Prodigal Son [m], and in another to interpret

Jerom *kept at* Rome, *and employed by him.*

[f] Bolland. propyl. p. 59. [g] Id. ib. & Du Pin. Biblioth. p. 459. [h] Holſten. coll. Rom. t. 1. p. 37, & 180. [i] Hier. ep. 124, & 144. [k] Id. ep. 11. Ruff. de Orig. p. 197. [l] Hier. ep. 144. [m] Id. ep. 146.

the

the Word *Hosanna*, which he says was differently interpreted by different Writers, who seemed to contradict each other [n]. In Compliance with this Request, *Jerom* wrote the Piece on that Subject, which is still extant. It was likewise at the Desire of *Damasus* that he corrected the *Latin* Version of the New Testament, and revised at *Rome* the *Latin* Version of the Psalms, comparing it with the *Greek* Text of the *Septuagint*. But as to the Letter, with which *Damasus* is supposed to have encouraged him to undertake that Work, it is evidently supposititious, and altogether unworthy of him.

Psalmody falsly ascribed to him.

Anastasius ascribes to *Damasus* the Custom of Singing, instead of Reading, the Psalms at Divine Service [o]. But it is manifest from *Austin*, that this Practice was brought from the East, and first complied with by the Church of *Milan* [p], in the Year 386. that is, Two Years after the Death of *Damasus*. So long as *Damasus* lived, *Jerom* continued at *Rome*; but as, by his Learning and exemplary Life, he was an Eye-sore to the lewd, ignorant, and haughty Clergy of *Rome*, or, as he styles them, *the Senate of Pharisees* [q], he thought it adviseable to abandon the City upon the Death of his great Friend and Protector, and retire to *Jerusalem*, hoping to find there that Quiet and Tranquillity which he despaired of being able to enjoy while he dwelt with *the Scarlet Whore* [r], that is, while he lived at *Rome*. As for the Character of *Damasus*; *Jerom* styles him, *a Virgin Doctor of the Virgin Church*; and, in his Letter to *Eustochium*, *a Man of great Excellence*. *Theodoret* commends him as a Man of a holy Life, as one who declined no Fatigue or Labour to support and maintain the Doctrine of the Apostles, and who struck the *Arians* with Terror, though he attacked them at a Distance [s]. Elsewhere he calls him the *famous Damasus* [t], and places him at the Head of the most celebrated Teachers of Truth, who, till his Time, had appeared in the West [u]. That *Greek* Writer could not be biassed in his favour, though *Jerom* perhaps was. The Orientals declared, in 431. that they followed the Example of *Damasus*, and other Persons eminent for Learning [w]; and the Council of *Chalcedon*, speaking of his Letter to *Paulinus* of *Antioch*, styles him the Honour and Glory of *Rome* for Piety and Justice [x]. The Church of *Rome* honours him as a Saint, and his Festi-

His Character.

[n] Id. ep. 144. [o] Anast. c. 38. [p] Aug. confess. l. 9. c. 7. [q] Hier. in præf. version. Dyd. de Spir. Sanct. [r] Id. ib. [s] Theod. l. 5. c. 2. & l. 4. c. 27. [t] Id. ep. 144. [u] Ep. 145. [w] Concil. t. 3. p. 740. [x] Concil. t. 4. p. 82.

val

val is kept in ſome Places on the 10th, in others on the 11th of *December*. But, after all, that he got the Pontificate by the moſt horrible Violence and Bloodſhed; that he lived in great State; that he had frequent and grand Entertainments; that he kept a Table, which, in Sumptuouſneſs, vied with the Tables of the Emperors themſelves; and all this at the Expence of the *Roman* Ladies, whoſe generous Contributions might have been applied to better Uſes, is affirmed by cotemporary and unexceptionable Writers. It is likewiſe manifeſt from the Letters of *Jerom*, that in his Time the Diſcipline of the Church was greatly relaxed; that the Obſervance of the primitive Canons was almoſt utterly neglected; and that Luxury, Ignorance, and Debauchery, univerſally prevailed among the Eccleſiaſtics at *Rome*. And this Charge againſt his Clergy in ſome degree recoils upon him, ſince he appears to have carried the Papal Authority farther than any of his Predeceſſors, and therefore might have reſtrained and corrected them. Whether his Sanctity may not from all this be juſtly queſtioned, notwithſtanding the favourable Teſtimony of ſome antient Writers, I leave the Reader to judge.

VALENTINIAN, THEODOSIUS, **SYRICIUS,** ARCADIUS, HONORIUS.

Thirty-ſeventh BISHOP *of* Rome.

SYRICIUS, the Succeſſor of *Damaſus*, according to the Pontificals, and ſome antient Monuments quoted and received by *Baronius* [o], was a Native of *Rome*, the Son of one *Tiburtius*, had been firſt Reader, and afterwards Deacon, under *Liberius*, and, upon his Death, had zealouſly eſpouſed the Cauſe of *Damaſus* againſt *Urſinus* and his Party. *Damaſus* being dead, he was choſen in his room by the unanimous Acclamations of the whole *Roman* People, being at that time Presbyter of the Church known by the Title of *the Paſtor*, perhaps the moſt antient Church in *Rome* [p]. *Urſinus*, who was ſtill alive, did not fail, upon the Vacancy of the See, to revive his former Claim, but he was rejected with Scorn and Indignation. *Valentinian* the younger, who then reigned in *Italy* under

Year of Chriſt 384.

[o] Bar. ad ann. 385. n. 5. Anaſt. c. 29. Boll. Apr. t. 1. p. 32. [p] Vide Bar. ad ann. 385. n. 5.

the Direction of his Mother *Juſtina*, received the News of this Election with great Joy; and, concluding, from the Unanimity of the Electors, the Worth and Merit of the Perſon elected, confirmed *Syricius* in his new Dignity, by a Reſcript dated the 23d of *February*, and directed to *Pinianus*, at that Time either Prefect or Vicar of *Rome* [q] (A).

His Anſwer to Himerius *Biſhop of* Tarragon.

The firſt Thing I read of *Syricius* is his anſwering a Letter or Relation which *Himerius*, Biſhop of *Tarragon* in *Spain*, had ſent to *Damaſus* by *Baſſianus*, a Presbyter of that Church, requiring the Advice of the Church of *Rome* concerning ſome Points of Diſcipline, and certain Abuſes that prevailed in *Spain*. *Damaſus* being dead before the Arrival of *Baſſianus*, *Syricius*, who had ſucceeded him, cauſed this Relation or Letter to be read, and carefully examined, in an Aſſembly of his Brethren, that is, perhaps, of the Biſhops who had aſſiſted at his Ordination; and, having maturely weighed and conſidered every Article, he firſt acquainted *Himerius* with his Promotion, and then returned to each the following Anſwers [r]. The Firſt was concerning the Sacrament of Baptiſm, which was by ſome Biſhops of *Spain* rejected as null and invalid, when conferred by an *Arian* Miniſter. In Oppoſition to them, *Syricius* alleges the Authority of *Liberius*, and of the Council of *Nice*, the Practice of the Church of *Rome*, and that of all other Churches both in the Eaſt and Weſt [s]. *Iſidorus* of *Seville* takes particular notice of this Point of Diſcipline, which he ſays was eſtabliſhed by the Letter of *Syricius* [t]. By the Second Article he forbids the Sacrament of Baptiſm to be adminiſtred at *Chriſtmas*, or the *Epiphany*, on the Feaſts of the Apoſtles or Martyrs, or at any other Time but at *Eaſter*, and during the *Pentecoſt* of that Feſtival, meaning, in all Likelihood, all *Eaſter* time, or the Fifty Days between *Eaſter* and *Pentecoſt*, or *Whitſuntide* for ſuch, adds he, is the Practice of the Church of *Rome*, and of all other Churches. From this Rule, however, he excepts Children, and all Perſons, who

[q] Id. ib. n. 6. [r] Concil. t. 1. p. 69, 689—691. [s] Ib. p. 689. [t] Iſid. ſer. c. 3.

(A) *Damaſus* died on the 10th or 11th of *December* 384. as I have related above, and *Syricius* was choſen the ſame Year, as we read in the Chronicle of *Proſper*. *Anaſtaſius* therefore, and the Author of the Pontifical publiſhed by *Bollandus*, as well as *Baronius*, were certainly miſtaken in affirming, upon what Grounds I know not, that, upon the Death of *Damaſus*, the See remained vacant for the Space of 31 or 36 Days (1).

(1) Anaſt. p. 21. Boll. Apr. t. 1. p. 32. Bar. ib. n. 5.

are any ways in Danger [u]. By the Third Article, he forbids granting the Grace of Reconciliation to Apoſtates, that is, forgiving and re-admitting them to the Communion of the Church, except at the Point of Death [w]. By the Fourth, a Woman, who, being betrothed to one Man, has received the Prieſt's Bleſſing to marry him, is debarred from marrying another. The Fifth Article commands all Perſons, who, being guilty of a Crime, have performed Penance for it, to be treated as the Apoſtates, if they relapſe into the ſame Crime; and the Sixth, all religious Perſons, whether Men or Women, guilty of Fornication, to be dealt with in the ſame Manner, and, moreover, to be excluded from partaking of the ſacred Myſteries, that is, of the Euchariſt, except at the Point of Death [x]. How different is the preſent Practice of the Church of *Rome* from that of the ſame Church in the Fourth Century! which was perhaps even too ſevere.

Prieſts and Deacons obliged to obſerve Celibacy.

Syricius, by the Seventh Article of his Letter, obliges all Prieſts and Deacons to obſerve Celibacy; and as ſome had not paid due Obedience to that Command of the Church, he allows thoſe who ſhould acknowlege their Fault, and plead Ignorance, to continue in their Rank, though without Hopes of riſing: but as for thoſe who ſhould preſume to defend this Abuſe as lawful, he declares them depoſed and degraded from the Rank they held in the Church [y]. Pope *Innocent* I. writing to *Exuperius* Biſhop of *Toulouſe*, quotes and tranſcribes great Part of this Article [z]. The Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Articles deſcribe at length the Life which thoſe ought to have led, who are raiſed by the Clergy and People to the Epiſcopal Dignity, and the Steps or Degrees by which they ſhould aſcend to it. They ought firſt to have been Readers; at the Age of Thirty, Acolytes, Subdeacons, and Deacons; Five Years after, Presbyters; and in that Degree they were to continue Ten Years before they could be choſen Biſhops. Thoſe who had been married to Two Wives, or to a Widow, are abſolutely excluded from ever ſitting in the Epiſcopal See. Even the Lectors are forbidden, on pain of Depoſition, to marry twice, or to marry a Widow [a]. Theſe, and ſeveral other leſs important Regulations, *Syricius* delivers as general Rules to be inviolably obſerved by all Churches, often declaring, that thoſe who do not readily comply with them ſhall be ſeparated from his Communion by the Sentence of a Synod, and ſtrictly injoining the chief Prelates of each Province to

[u] Con. ib. [w] Ib. p. 690. [x] Ibid. [y] Ib. p. 689, 690. [z] Inn. ep. 3. c. 1. t. 1. p. 755, 756. [a] Ib. & p. 691.

take care they be punctually obſerved within the Bounds of their reſpective Juriſdictions, on Pain of being depoſed, and treated as they deſerve. He therefore deſires *Himerius* to notify his Letter, not only to all the Biſhops of his Dioceſe or Province, but likewiſe to thoſe of *Carthagena*, *Bætica*, *Luſitania*, *Galicia*, and to all the neighbouring Biſhops, meaning perhaps thoſe of *Gaul*; for *Innocent* I. ſuppoſes the Decrees of his Predeceſſor *Syricius* to be known to *Exuperius* of *Toulouſe* [a]; and in all Likelihood they were ſo to others in that Country.

This Letter is the Firſt of all the Decretals acknowleged, by the Learned, to be genuine, and likewiſe the Firſt in all the antient Collections of the Canons of the *Latin* Church. It is quoted by *Innocent* I. and *Iſidore* of *Seville*, and is the only Letter of the many aſcribed to *Syricius*, that *Dionyſius Exiguus* has inſerted in his Collection. It is to be found in Father *Queſnel's Roman Code* [b]; and *Creſconius* quotes no other Decrees of *Syricius* but what are taken from this Letter. It is dated the Third of the Ides of *February*, that is the Eleventh of that Month 385. *Arcadius* and *Bauto* being Conſuls (A).

The Celibacy of the Clergy firſt propoſed in the Council of Elvira.

As Prieſts and Deacons are commanded, by the Seventh Article of this Letter, to abſtain from Marriage, and this is the firſt Opportunity that has offered of mentioning the Celibacy of the Clergy, a ſhort Digreſſion on ſuch a material Point of Diſcipline in the Church may not, perhaps, be unacceptable to the Reader. The laying of this

[a] Inn. ep. 3. c. 1. t. 1. p. 755, 756.

[b] Cod. Rom. a Queſ. cum Leone edit. c. 29. p. 118.

(A) The Jeſuit *Papebrok* highly extols this Letter (1), but, at the ſame time, does not think it quite pure and genuine, becauſe the Date, ſays he, has been added to it; for the other Letters of *Syricius*, and likewiſe thoſe of his Predeceſſors, bear no Date. But can we conclude from thence, that they never had any? Some of the Letters of *Innocent* I. are dated, and ſome without a Date, and he admits both. The Tranſcribers contented themſelves, for the moſt part, with copying the Body of the Letter, and neglected the reſt. *Papebrok* adds, that the Date ought to have been expreſſed thus: *Arcadio Aug. et Bautone viro clar. Conſſ.* and not *Arcadio et Bautone viris clariſſimis*, as it is in that Letter. But might not this Miſtake be owing to the Ignorance of the Tranſcribers, who, finding, in the Original, only the Two Letters, *V. C.* which are to be met with in many antient Writings, ſet down *viris clariſſimis*, inſtead of *viro clariſſimo*? *Papebrok* muſt have obſerved the ſame Miſtake in the Letter, which Pope *Innocent* I. wrote to the Council of *Milevum* (2), and which he allows to be altogether genuine. For Slips or Overſights of this Nature, hardly avoidable, no Piece ought to be condemned, or even ſuſpected.

(1) Bolland. prop. p. 58.

(2) Concil. t. 2. p. 1289.

heavy

heavy Burden on the Shoulders of the Clergy, a Burden too heavy for moſt of them to bear, as Experience has ſhewn, was firſt moved in the Council of *Elvira*, held about the Year 300. according to the moſt probable Opinion; and, being warmly promoted by the celebrated *Oſius* of *Cordoua*, and *Felix* of *Acci*, now *Guadix* in *Andaluſia*, who preſided at that Aſſembly, it paſſed into a Law; and all Biſhops, Presbyters, Deacons, and Subdeacons, were commanded, on Pain of Depoſition, *to abſtain from Wives, and the begetting of Children.* Theſe are the very Words of the 33d Canon of that Council [c]. That, till this time, the Clergy were allowed to marry, even in *Spain*, is manifeſt from the 65th Canon of the ſame Council, excluding from the Communion of the Church, even at the Point of Death, ſuch Eccleſiaſtics, as, knowing their Wives to be guilty of Adultery, ſhould not, upon the firſt Notice of their Crime, immediately turn them out of Doors [d]. How long the 33d Canon continued in Vigour, is uncertain; nay, it may be queſtioned whether it ever took place: if it ever did, it was out of Date, or at leaſt not generally obſerved by the *Spaniſh* Clergy, in the Time of *Syricius*, as evidently appears from the Words of his Letter, or Anſwer to *Himerius* of *Tarragon*: I ſaid, by the *Spaniſh* Clergy; for no ſuch Injunction had yet been laid on the Eccleſiaſtics of any other Country or Nation. About Fifteen Years after, was held the Council of *Ancyra*, in which it was decreed, That *if any Deacon did not declare at his Ordination, that he deſigned to marry, he ought not to be allowed to marry after; but might, if he made ſuch a Declaration, becauſe, in that Caſe, the Biſhop tacitly conſented to it.* The Council of *Neocæſarea*, which aſſembled ſoon after that of *Ancyra*, and conſiſted, in great Part, of the ſame Biſhops, commanded *ſuch Preſbyters as married after their Ordination to be degraded.* In the Year 325. was held the Council of *Nice*; and, in that great Aſſembly, it was moved, perhaps by *Oſius*, who acted a chief Part there, that Biſhops, Presbyters, Deacons, and Subdeacons, ſhould be debarred from all Commerce with the Wives they had married before their Ordination. But this Motion was warmly oppoſed by *Paphnutius*, who had himſelf ever led a chaſte and ſingle Life, and was one of the moſt eminent and illuſtrious Prelates, at that time, in the Church. He repreſented, that the Burden they propoſed laying on the Clergy,

[c] Cont. t. 1. p. 1210. [d] Ib. p. 1329.

was

was too heavy; that few had ſufficient Strength to bear it; that the Women, thus abandoned by their Husbands, would be expoſed to great Dangers; that Marriage was no Pollution, but, according to St. *Paul*, commendable; that thoſe therefore, who were not married, when firſt admitted to the Sacerdotal Functions, ſhould continue in that State; and ſuch as were, ſhould continue to live with their Wives. Thus *Sozomen* [e], *Socrates* [f], and *Suidas* [g] (B).

The Advice of Paphnutius *was applauded by the whole Aſſembly*, add the above-mentioned Hiſtorians, *and the Point in Diſpute was left undecided.* In the Year 340. it was decreed, in the Council of *Arles*, that *no Man, incumbered with a Wife, ſhould be admitted to Holy Orders, unleſs he promiſed, with his Wife's Approbation and Conſent, to abſtain for ever from the conjugal Duty.*

This is all I can find in the antient Records concerning the Continence or Celibacy of the Clergy, before the Time of *Syricius*. And hence it is manifeſt, that both *Clichtonæus* and *Melanchthon* were greatly miſtaken; the former in affirming, which many have done after him, that Celibacy was firſt impoſed upon the Clergy by *Syricius* [h]; and the latter by confidently aſſerting, that Celibacy was not required of the Miniſters of the Goſpel by any Council, but by the Popes, in Oppoſition to all Councils and Synods [i]. It muſt be owned, however, that this Law was not ſo generally obſerved before the Time of *Syricius*, as it was after. For it was not long after his Time before it became an eſtabliſhed Point of Diſcipline in moſt of the Weſtern Churches, not in virtue of his Letter, or of thoſe which his Succeſſors wrote to the ſame Purpoſe, but becauſe it was injoined by the Synods of each particular Nation. Thus it was eſtabliſhed in

[e] Soz. l. 1. c. 23. [f] Socr. l. 1. c. 11. [g] Suid. in vit. Paph. [h] Chricht. de contin. ſacerd. c. 4. [i] Melanch. in Apol. p. 13.

(B) I am not unappriſed, that this Account is rejected by *Baronius* (1), and *Bellarmine* (2), as fabulous; but, notwithſtanding the Pains they have both taken to make it appear incredible, *F. Lupus* allows it to be true (3), though a no leſs zealous Stickler for the Diſcipline of the Church of *Rome* than either of them. *Ruffinus*, I own, takes no notice of this Tranſaction, as *Valeſius* well obſerves. But has no true Tranſaction been, either wilfully or ignorantly, omitted by that Writer? *Valeſius* well knows, that many have; and had he peruſed that Author with a little more Attention, he would not have ſo poſitively affirmed, that no one ever named *Paphnutius* among the Biſhops of *Egypt*, who aſſiſted at the Council of *Nice*, ſince he is named among them by *Ruffinus*, and with great Commendations (4).

(1) Bar. ad ann. 58. n. 21. (2) Bell. de cler. l. 1. c. 20. (3) Lup. in can. p. 114. (4) Ruf. l. 1. c. 4.

Africa

Africa by the Council of *Carthage* in 390. in *Gaul* by one held at *Orleans*, by Two at *Tours*, and one at *Agde*; in *Spain*, by Three held at *Toledo*; in *Germany*, by the Councils of *Aquiſgranum*, or *Aix la Chapelle*, of *Worms*, and of *Mentz*. We know of none in *Britain*: and that it did not even begin to take place here till the Arrival of *Auſtin*, in the Sixth Century, may be ſufficiently proved from the Letters of that Monk to *Gregory*, and *Gregory*'s Anſwer to him; but of that more hereafter (C).

The preſent Practice of the Church of Rome, *with reſpect to this Point.*

As to the preſent Practice and Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, with reſpect to this, in their Opinion, moſt eſſential Point of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, no Man is allowed, after his Ordination, to marry, or to cohabit with the Wife he had married before; nay, in order to prevent all poſſible means even of any clandeſtine Commerce between them, the Woman muſt, by a ſolemn Vow of Chaſtity, renounce all Claims on her Husband, and, retiring into a Monaſtery, bind herſelf by a ſecond Vow to continue there, without ever once going out, on any Pretence whatſoever, ſo long as her Husband lives, who cannot be admitted ſo much as to the Rank of a Subdeacon, till ſhe is ſecured by theſe Two Vows. Such is the preſent Practice of the Church of *Rome*, though Subdeacons were allowed to marry long after the Time of *Syricius*, who, in his Letter, mentions only Deacons and Presbyters, and does not even oblige them to part with their Wives, but only excludes them from riſing to a higher Degree in the Church. Pope *Leo the Great*, choſen in 440. was the firſt who extended the Law of Celibacy to the Subdeacons, commanding them,

(C) I cannot forbear taking notice here of an inexcuſable Miſtake in the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of* England, *by* Nicolas Harpſfeld, *Archdeacon of* Canterbury, a Work in great Requeſt abroad. That Writer tells us, that *Reſtitutus*, Biſhop of *London*, aſſiſted at the Council of *Arles*, and ſigned the above-mentioned Canon, forbidding a Man incumbered with a Wife to be admitted to Orders, unleſs he promiſed, with her Conſent, to refrain from all Commerce with her after his Ordination. He leaves us to infer from thence, that this Canon was received in *Britain* (1). But ſurely *Harpſfeld* muſt never have ſeen either the Subſcriptions, or the Acts of that Council. Had he ſeen the Subſcriptions, he had hardly omitted Two *Britiſh* Biſhops out of Three. For, beſides the Names of *Reſtitutus*, I find among the Subſcriptions, the Names of *Adelphus de colonia Londinenſium*, that is, as is commonly believed, of *Colcheſter*, and of *Hibernus* of *Eboracum*, or *York*. Had he ſeen the Acts, he had never been guilty of ſuch a groſs Miſtake as to aſcribe the above-mentioned Canon to the Council of *Arles*, at which *Reſtitutus* aſſiſted; ſince that Council was held againſt the *Donatiſts* of *Africa*, in the Year 314. and not the leaſt Mention was made there of the Celibacy of the Clergy (2). The Second Council of *Arles* was held about Twenty-ſix Years after, and of that Council the ſaid Canon is the Second.

(1) Harpſ. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Anglican. p. 26.

(2) Concil. t. 1. p. 1426—1429.

in

in a Letter, which he wrote about the Year 442. to *Rusticus* Bishop of *Narbonne*, to abstain, as well as the Deacons, Presbyters, and Bishops, from all Commerce with their Wives. But this Law was observed by very few Churches. In the Time of Pope *Gregory the Great*, that is, in the Latter-end of the Sixth Century, it had not yet taken place, even in *Sicily*, though reckoned among the *Suburbicarian* Provinces: it was first introduced into that Island by him; but he allowed those to cohabit with their Wives, who had been ordained without a previous Promise to live continent, though he would not suffer them to be raised to a higher Degree without such a Promise. *Bellarmine* [h], and the other Divines of the Church of *Rome*, to soften the Odium, which the hard, and commonly impracticable Command she lays on her Clergy, must reflect on her, represent Continency as a Virtue to be easily acquired. Their Ascetics seem better acquainted with the Difficulties and Struggles attending the Practice of that Virtue, than their Divines; for they prescribe, as the sole Means of attaining it, constant Prayer, frequent Fasting, macerating the rebelling Flesh with all kinds of Austerities, and principally the avoiding of all Female Company. And, if these be the sole Means of attaining it, I leave the Reader to judge how few of their Clergy do attain it.

In the primitive Church, married and unmarried Men raised indiscriminately to Ecclesiastical Dignities.

No one is so little versed in the History of the Church, as not to know, that, in the Three first Centuries of the Christian Religion, married and unmarried Men were indiscriminately raised to the Episcopal, and every other Ecclesiastical Dignity; nay, *Jerom* writes, that in his Time, that is, in the Fourth Century, the former were, for the most part, preferred to the latter, not in regard of their greater Merit, but because, in such Elections, the unmarried Men were outnumbered by the married, who chose to be governed by one in their own Station of Life [i]. It is hence manifest, that Marriage was not thought, in *Jerom*'s Time, inconsistent with, or any Bar to, the Episcopal Dignity. And why should it? since, excepting St. *John*, the Apostles themselves were all married, as we are told, in express Terms, by *Ignatius* the Martyr [k], who was their Cotemporary and Disciple, and whose Authority ought, on that Consideration, to be of greater Weight than that of all the other Fathers together. *But such of the primitive Clergy*, says *Bellarmine* [l], *as were married be-*

[h] Bellar. de cler. l. 1. c. 21. [i] Hier. in Jovin. l. 1. [k] Ign. ep. ad Philadelp.
[l] Bell. de cler. l. 1. c. 20.

fore

fore their Ordination, abſtained ever after from the Uſe of Matrimony: let our Adverſaries produce, if they can, but a ſingle Evidence of a Presbyter or Biſhop's having any Commerce with their Wives. It lies upon him to ſhew they had not. We know nothing to the contrary, and therefore may well ſuppoſe, that, purſuant to the Advice given by the Apoſtle to all Husbands and Wives, they *came together* after Ordination as they did before, *leſt Satan ſhould tempt them for their Incontinency.*

Celibacy recommended by the Fathers:

The Fathers, it is true, out of a miſtaken Notion of an extraordinary Merit attending Celibacy in this Life, and an extraordinary Reward reſerved for it in the other, began very early to recommend it to Perſons of all Ranks and Stations, but more eſpecially to the Clergy, as the principal Excellence and Perfection of a Chriſtian. By their Exhortations, and the Praiſes they were conſtantly beſtowing on Virginity, Celibacy, and Continence, many among the Clergy, and even ſome of the Laity, were wrought up to ſuch a Pitch of Enthuſiaſm, as to mutilate themſelves, thinking they could by no other means be ſufficiently qualified for the unnatural, but meritorious, State of Celibacy. And, what is very ſurpriſing, this Practice became ſo common in the End of the Third, and the Beginning of the Fourth, Century, that the Fathers of *Nice* were obliged to reſtrain it by a particular Canon. They enacted one accordingly, excluding for ever from the Prieſthood, ſuch *as ſhould make themſelves Eunuchs, the Preſervation of their Life or Health not requiring ſuch a Mutilation.* By the ſame Canon they depoſed and degraded all, who ſhould thus maim themſelves after their Ordination [l]. But tho' the Fathers warmly recommended Celibacy to the unmarried Clergy, and Continence to the married, neither was looked upon as an Obligation, till late in the Fourth Century, and not even then in all Places; for *Epiphanius*, who lived till the Beginning of the Fifth, writes, that though *Men ſtill begetting Children* were excluded by the Eccleſiaſtical Canons from every Dignity and Degree in the Church, yet they were in ſome Places admitted as Subdeacons, Deacons, and Presbyters, becauſe thoſe Canons were not yet univerſally obſerved [m]; ſo that, according to *Epiphanius*, it was not by the Apoſtles (as the Divines of the Chutch of *Rome* pretend), but by the Eccleſiaſtical Canons, that this Obligation was laid on the Clergy; and, in his

never injoined by the Apoſtles:

[l] Theod. l. 1. c. 7. Concil. l. 2. p. 28, 29. Ambr. ep. 25. [m] Epiph. hæreſ. 59.

Time, thoſe Canons were not yet univerſally complied with; nor indeed many Ages after: nay, in the *Greek* Church, the Clergy are to this Day, allowed to cohabit with the Wives they married before their Ordination; and, in this Kingdom, Celibacy was not univerſally eſtabliſhed till after the Conqueſt, as I ſhall have Occaſion to ſhew in the Sequel of the preſent Hiſtory.

deemed by the Pagans the higheſt Degree of Sanctity.

The abſtaining from lawful, as well as unlawful, Pleaſures, was deemed, by the antient Pagans, eſpecially in the Eaſt, the higheſt Degree of Sanctity and Perfection. Hence ſome of their Prieſts, in Compliance with this Notion, and to recommend themſelves to the Eſteem of the People, did not only profeſs, promiſe, and vow an eternal Abſtinence from all Pleaſures of that Nature, as thoſe of the Church of *Rome* do, but put it out of their Power ever to enjoy them. Thus the Prieſts of *Cybele*, *by becoming Prieſts, ceaſed to be Men*, to borrow the Expreſſion of *Jerom*; and the *Hierophantes*, who were the firſt Miniſters of Religion among the *Athenians*, rendered themſelves equally incapable of tranſgreſſing the Vows they had made, by conſtantly drinking the cold Juice of Hemlock [n]. A *Stoic*, called *Cheremon*, introduced by *Jerom* to deſcribe the Lives of the *Egyptian* Prieſts, tells us, among other things, that, from the time they addicted themſelves to the Service of the Gods, they renounced all Intercourſe and Commerce with Women; and, the better to conquer their natural Inclinations, abſtained altogether from Meat and Wine. Several other Inſtances might be alleged to ſhew, that Celibacy was embraced and practiſed by the Pagan Prieſts, long before the Birth of the Chriſtian Religion; and, conſequently, that it was not Religion, but Superſtition, that firſt laid the Prieſthood under ſuch an Obligation. The Church of *Rome* has borrowed, as is notorious, ſeveral Ceremonies, Cuſtoms, and Practices of the Pagans, and perhaps the Celibacy of the Prieſthood among the reſt: I ſay, *perhaps*, becauſe it might have been ſuggeſted to her by the ſame Spirit of Superſtition, that ſuggeſted it to them: for where-ever the ſame Spirit prevails, it will ever operate in the ſame manner, and be attended with the ſame, or the like Effects. Thus we find the ſame Auſterities practiſed by the Pagans in the *Eaſt-Indies*, and other idolatrous Nations, that are practiſed and recommended by the Church of *Rome*; and yet no Man can imagine thoſe Auſterities to have been by

[n] Hier. l. 2. in Jov.

either

either borrowed of the other. There is almoſt an intire Conformity between the Laws, Diſcipline, and Hierarchy of the antient *Druids*, and the preſent *Roman-Catholic* Clergy; nay, the latter claim the very ſame Privileges, Prerogatives, and Exemptions, as were claimed and enjoyed by the former[o]: and yet we cannot well ſuppoſe them to have been guided therein by their Example. Celibacy was diſcountenanced by the *Romans*, who nevertheleſs had their *Veſtals*, inſtituted by their ſecond King at a Time when, the new City being yet thinly inhabited, Marriage ought in both Sexes to have been moſt encouraged: and the ſame Spirit, which ſuggeſted to that ſuperſtitious Prince the Inſtitution of the Veſtals, ſuggeſted the like Inſtitutions to other Pagan Nations, and to the Church of *Rome* that of ſo many different Orders of Nuns.

How much better had the Church of *Rome* conſulted her own Reputation, had ſhe either, in Oppoſition to the Pagan Prieſthood, allowed her Clergy the Uſe of Matrimony, or, by a more perfect Imitation of their Diſcipline, with the Law of Celibacy, preſcribed the like Methods of obſerving it! How many Enormities had been prevented by either of theſe Means, the World knows. But none of her Clergy have the Obſervance of their Vows ſo much at Heart as to imitate either the *Athenian* or the *Egyptian* Prieſts: and as for thoſe of *Cybele*, they are ſo far from conforming to their Practice, that a Law ſubjecting them to it has kept them out of Proteſtant Kingdoms, when the Fear of Death could not.

The Celibacy of the Clergy a bad Inſtitution.

If every Law or Inſtitution is to be judged good or evil, according to the Good and Evil attending them, it is by daily Experience but too manifeſt, that the forced Celibacy of the Clergy ought to be demeed of all Inſtitutions the very worſt. Indeed all ſenſible Men of that Church know and lament the innumerable Evils which the Celibacy of her Clergy occaſions, and muſt always occaſion, in ſpite of all Remedies that can be applied to it. But ſhe finds one Advantage in it, which, in her Eyes, makes more than ſufficient amends for all thoſe Evils, *viz.* her ingroſſing by that means to herſelf all the Thoughts and Attention of her Clergy, which, were they allowed to marry, would be divided between her and their Families, and each of them would have a ſeparate Intereſt from that of the Church. Several Cuſtoms and Practices, once warmly eſpouſed by that Church, have, in Proceſs of Time, been abrogated and quite laid aſide, on ac-

[o] Vide Cæſ. comm. de bell. Gall. l. 6. Cap. div. 1. 1.

count of the Inconveniences attending them; and this, which long Experience has ſhewn to be attended with more pernicious Conſequences than any other, had, but for that political View, been likewiſe aboliſhed.

Another Letter of Syricius.

Another Letter, univerſally aſcribed to *Syricius*, has reached our Times. It is written in a very perplexed and obſcure Style; bears no Date; is not to be found either in *Dionyſius Exiguus*, or any antient Code; and is addreſſed to *all the Orthodox dwelling in different Provinces* [a]: Which is manifeſtly a Miſtake, ſince *Syricius* deſires thoſe, to whom it is addreſſed, to confirm it with their Subſcriptions, which cannot be underſtood but of Biſhops. However, as it is received by all as genuine, I ſhall not take upon me to reject it as ſpurious. The Subject of this Letter is the Ordination of the Miniſters of the Church; and the Firſt Article is againſt thoſe who pretend to paſs from the Vanities of the World to the Epiſcopal Dignity. *Syricius* writes, that they came often to him, attended with numerous Retinues, begging him to ordain them; but that they had never been able to prevail upon him to grant them their Requeſt. In the Second Article he complains of the Monks, who were conſtantly wandering about the Country, and on whom the Biſhops choſe rather to confer holy Orders, and the Epiſcopal Dignity itſelf, than to relieve them with Alms. The Third and laſt Article forbids a Layman or Neophyte to be ordained either Deacon or Presbyter. If this Letter be genuine, *Syricius* was the firſt Biſhop of *Rome* who ſtyled himſelf *Pope*, as *Papebrok* well obſerves [b]; for the Title of his Letter, as tranſmitted to us, runs thus; *Pope Syricius* to *the Orthodox*, &c. The Word imports no more than Father, and it was antiently given, out of Reſpect, to all Biſhops, as I have obſerved elſewhere; but I have found none before *Syricius* who diſtinguiſhed themſelves with that Title.

Jerom *retires from* Rome.

Jerom continued at *Rome* ſome Months after the Death of his great Patron *Damaſus*. But finding himſelf obnoxious to the *Roman* Clergy, for the Liberty he had taken in ſome of his Writings to cenſure their effeminate and licentious Lives, and, on the other hand, not being countenanced and ſupported by *Syricius*, as he had been by his Predeceſſor, he thought it adviſeable to abandon that City, and return to *Palæſtine*. Some pretend, but without ſufficient Authority, that *Syricius* joined the reſt in reviling and perſecuting him.

[a] Concil. t. 2. p. 1028. [b] Bolland. prop. p. 213.

Baronius

Baronius has inſerted, in his Annals [c], a Letter from the Uſurper *Maximus*, who reigned in *Gaul*; from which we learn, that *Syricius* had wrote firſt to him, exhorting him to continue ſteady in the Catholic Faith; being, perhaps, apprehenſive leſt he ſhould ſuffer himſelf to be impoſed upon by the *Priſcillianiſts*, who were very numerous in *Gaul*, and complaining to him of the undue Ordination of a Preſbyter named *Agricius*. *Maximus*, in his Anſwer, pretends great Zeal for the true Faith, and promiſes to aſſemble the Biſhops of *Gaul*, and of the Five Provinces, meaning *Gallia Narbonenſis*, to examine the Affair of *Agricius*. He aſſures *Syricius*, that he has nothing ſo much at Heart as to maintain the Catholic Faith pure and uncorrupted, to ſee a perfect Harmony eſtabliſhed among the Prelates of the Church, and to ſuppreſs the many Diſorders which had prevailed at the Time of his Acceſſion to the Empire, and would have ſoon proved incurable, had they been neglected. He adds, that many ſhocking Abominations of the *Manichees*, meaning no doubt the *Priſcillianiſts*, had been diſcovered, not by groundleſs Conjectures and Surmiſes, but by their own Confeſſion before the Magiſtrates, as *Syricius* might learn from the Acts. For *Maximus* cauſed the Ringleaders of that Sect to be put to Death this very Year, convicted before the Magiſtrates of the groſſeſt Immoralities (A). Theſe were *Priſcillian* himſelf, *Felicisſimus*,

The Uſurper Maximus *writes to* Syricius.

[c] Bar. ad ann. 387. n. 65, 66. ex t. 1. ep. Rom. Pont. p. 48.

(A) The firſt Author of this Sect was one *Mark*, a Native of *Memphis* in *Egypt*, a famous Magician, and once a Follower of the Doctrine of the *Manichees* (1). From *Egypt* he travelled into *Spain*, where he had for his Diſciples a Woman of Quality named *Agapa*, *Elpidius* the Rhetorician, and *Agagius* (2). *Priſcillian*, of whom I ſhall ſpeak hereafter, was the Diſciple and Succeſſor of the two latter. *Jerom* tells us, upon the Authority of *Irenæus*, whom he quotes, that *Mark* paſſed from the Banks of the *Rhone* into *Aquitaine*, and from thence into *Spain* (3); which made *Baronius* write, that he firſt infected *Gaul* (4). But no ſuch thing was ever affirmed by *Irenæus*; and beſides, *Jerom* confounds the Sect of the *Marcoſians* with that of the *Priſcillianiſts*, and the Author of the former, who was cotemporary with *Irenæus*, with the Author of the latter, who lived in the Fourth Century.

The *Priſcillianiſts* broached no new Doctrine, but formed a new Sect, by adopting every impious Opinion that had been broached by others; whence their Sect is ſtyled by *Auſtin*, the common Sink of all other Hereſies (5). By their external Behaviour, which was extremely modeſt and compoſed, they gained many Followers, whom, by degrees, they let into the Abominations of their Sect; for there was no Lewdneſs which they did not encourage and practiſe, rejecting Matrimony for no other Reaſon, but becauſe it confined a Man to one Woman, and a Wo-

(1) Sulp. l. 2. p. 170. Iſid. Hiſp. de Scrip. Eccleſ. c. 2. (2) Ib. ib. (3) Hier. ep. 29. (4) Bar. ad ann. 381. n. 113, 114. (5) Aug. hær. 70. p. 13.

man

ciſſimus, and *Armenus*, Two Eccleſiaſtics, who had but very lately embraced his Doctrine; *Aſarinus* and *Aurelius*, Two Deacons; *Latronianus*, or, as *Jerom* calls him, *Matronianus*, a Layman, and *Eucbrocia*, the Widow of the Orator *Delphidius*, who had profeſſed Eloquence in the City of *Bourdeaux* a few Years before. Theſe were, by the Order of *Maximus*, all beheaded this Year at *Treves*. The reſt of *Priſcillian*'s Followers, whom they could diſcover and apprehend, were either baniſhed or confined.

They are honoured by their Followers as Saints and Martyrs.

But theſe Severities ſerved only to increaſe the Evil which they were employed to cure. The Bodies of *Priſcillian*, and of thoſe who had ſuffered with him, were conveyed by their Friends and Adherents into *Spain*, and there interred with great Pomp and Solemnity; their Names were added to thoſe of other Saints and Martyrs, their Firmneſs and Conſtancy extolled, and their Doctrine embraced by ſuch Numbers of Proſelytes, that it ſpread in a ſhort time over all the Provinces between the *Pyrenees* and the Ocean [d]. *Symphoſius*, Metropolitan of *Galicia*, whom, after the Death of *Priſcillian*, they looked upon as the chief Man and Head of their Sect, took care to fill all the vacant Sees in that Province with Biſhops of his own Communion. *Dictinius*, whom he raiſed among the reſt to that Dignity,

[d] Hier. ep. 29.

man to one Man (6). They held it no Crime to ſpeak contrary to what they thought and believed, and to confirm with an Oath what they ſaid when they were talking to People of a different Perſuaſion. This was one of their favourite Maxims, which above all others they took care to inculcate to their Proſelytes, often repeating to them, and among themſelves, the famous Verſe;

Jura, perjura, ſecretum prodere noli.

Swear, forſwear, but never betray a Secret (7).

Hence it was no eaſy Matter to diſcover them, for they mixed with the Orthodox at Divine Service, received the Sacraments of the Church, and diſowned, with the moſt ſolemn Oaths, the Doctrine which they had been heard by many to utter and teach (8). To this Sect *Priſcillian*, who gave Name to it, was gained by the abovementioned *Elpidius* and *Agagius*. He was a Man of Birth and Fortune, being deſcended of an antient and illuſtrious Family in *Spain*, and is ſaid to have been endowed with extraordinary Parts, and well verſed in every Branch of Learning; ſo that many were induced by his Example to embrace the new Sect, and more by his Eloquence; for he had a particular Gift of ſpeaking well, and gaining the Affections of all who heard him (9). Among his Followers were ſeveral Perſons of the firſt Rank, both Men and Women, and even ſome Biſhops, namely, *Vegetinus*, *Symphoſius*, *Inſtantius*, and *Salvianus*, of whom the two latter entered into an indiſſoluble League and Alliance with him (1).

(6) Id. ib. & Leo, ep. 93. (7) Aug. ib. ep. 253. & ad Con. c. 2. (8) Id. ib. (9) Sulp. l. 2. p. 170. Hier. in Iſai. 64. p. 240. (1) Sulp. ib. p. 171. Concil. t. 1. p. 741.

is

is ſuppoſed by St. *Auſtin* [e] to have been the Author of a Book, famous in thoſe Times, ſtyled *Libra*, or, the *Pound* (A). However, both he and *Symphoſius* were afterwards convinced of their Errors; and, deſiring thereupon to be reconciled with the Church, they undertook a Journey to *Milan*, in order to engage St. *Ambroſe*, Biſhop of that City, in their favours. He received them with the greateſt Marks of Kindneſs and Affection; and being ſatisfied with the Terms of Reconciliation, which they themſelves propoſed, and promiſed to obſerve, he wrote in their Behalf to the Biſhops of *Spain*, who, at his Requeſt, admitted them to their Communion [f] (B).

Many embrace their Doctrine.

Two of their leading Men renounce their Errors;

In the Year 438. of the *Spaniſh*, and 400. of the common Æra, a Council was held at *Toledo*; and, in the Preſence of that Aſſembly, *Symphoſius*, *Dictinius*, and *Comaſus*, one of *Symphoſius*'s Presbyters, ſolemnly abjured the Errors of *Priſcillian*, anathematized the Doctrine, Sect, and Books of that Heretic, and readily ſigned the Confeſſion of Faith which the Council had drawn up. Their Example was followed by Three other Biſhops, *viz. Paternus*, *Iſonius*, and *Vegetinus*, who were all admitted to the Communion of the Church, and even allowed to keep their Sees, though unduly preferred, *on Condition the Biſhops of* Rome *and* Milan *ſhould conſent thereto, and*

and are admitted to the Communion of the Church by the Council of Toledo.

[e] Aug. ad Con. c. 3. [f] Concil. t. 1. p. 742. ed. Binian.

(A) It was ſo called becauſe it contained Twelve Queſtions, as the *Roman* Pound did Twelve Ounces. In that Piece the Author endeavoured to prove, from the Practice of the Patriarchs, of the Prophets, Apoſtles, Angels, and of *Chriſt* himſelf, that a Lye could be no Crime, when uttered to conceal our Religion (2).

(B) That theſe two Biſhops ſhould have applied to St. *Ambroſe*, and not to *Syricius*, is what *Baronius* cannot brook; and therefore to bring in, right or wrong, the Biſhop of *Rome*, he quotes a Paſſage of the Council of *Toledo*, where the Fathers of that Aſſembly, ſpeaking of the Letter which St. *Ambroſe* had wrote in favour of *Symphoſius* and *Dictinius*, adds the following Words in a Parentheſis; *Which Things were likewiſe ſuggeſted by Pope* Syricius, *of holy Memory* (3). But as theſe Words have no manner of Connection with the reſt, it is manifeſt they have been foiſted in on Purpoſe to bring *Syricius* upon the Stage; and were we to admit them as genuine, we could only conclude from thence, that *Syricius* too had wrote to the Biſhops of *Spain* in Behalf of *Symphoſius* and *Dictinius*. *Baronius* indeed goes a great way farther; for he infers from the above-mentioned Words, that St. *Ambroſe* acted by the Advice and Direction of *Syricius*; and from thence by a ſecond Inference, which could occur to none but himſelf, that both *Ambroſe*, and *Simplicius*, who ſucceeded him in the See of *Milan*, were the Pope's Legates (4). It is by ſuch far-fetched Inferences and Deductions that he endeavours, throughout his voluminous Performance, to miſlead his unwary Readers into a Belief of the Pope's Supremacy.

(2) Id. ib. c. 2, & 18. n. 54. (3) Concil. t. 2. p. 1230. (4) Bar. ad ann. 405.

reſtore

reſtore them to the Peace of the Church g. From theſe Words, which are the very Words of the Council, it is manifeſt, firſt, that the Fathers, who compoſed that Aſſembly, were Strangers to the Biſhop of *Rome*'s univerſal Juriſdiction; and, ſecondly, that the Biſhop of *Milan* did not act, as *Baronius* pretends, on that Occaſion as the Pope's Legate. Their requiring the Approbation of the Biſhop of *Milan*, beſides that of the Biſhop of *Rome*, ſufficiently proves the one; and their requiring the Approbation of the Biſhop of *Rome*, beſides that of the Biſhop of *Milan*, the other.

The Acts of that Council confirmed by St. Ambroſe *and* Syricius.

Four other Biſhops, *viz. Herenius*, *Donatus*, *Acurius*, and *Æmilius*, could by no means be induced to follow the Example of *Symphoſius* and *Dictinius*; and were thereupon depoſed by the Council, and cut off from the Communion of the Catholic Church. The Biſhops of *Rome* and *Milan* not only confirmed the Acts of the Council with reſpect to *Symphoſius* and *Dictinius*, but ſeparated themſelves from the Communion of the Biſhops of *Bætica* and the *Carthageneſe*, who, thinking the Council had dealt too favourably with them, refuſed to admit them to their Communion [h]. *Dictinius* died in 420. and is now honoured in *Spain* as a Saint, though it may be juſtly queſtioned whether he deſerves that Honour. *Idatius* the Chronologiſt, who was a Native of *Spain*, and raiſed there to the Epiſcopal Dignity about the Year 428. mentions him without ſaying any thing in his Praiſe, or taking the leaſt notice of his being honoured then as a Saint. St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks doubtfully even of his Converſion [i], and at the ſame time tells us, that his Book was highly eſteemed by the *Priſcillianiſts*, and his Memory no leſs revered; which, notwithſtanding the eminent Sanctity aſcribed to him by *Baronius* [k], gives us room to ſuſpect, that the Honour now paid him is owing to a Tradition handed down by the *Priſcillianiſts*. For thus was *Priſcillian* himſelf once revered both as a Saint and a Martyr. Nay, the Author of the Notes on *Sulpitius Severus* aſſures us, that he has ſeen his Name in ſome, not very antient, Martyrologies; and *Petrus de Natalibus* has allowed, both to him, and to *Latronianus*, who ſuffered with him, a Place among the Martyrs of the Church, pretending to be countenancedtherein by the Authority of *Jerom* [l]. And truly it muſt be owned, that *Jerom*, in the Year 392. wrote very favourably of *Priſcillian*. *He was executed*, ſays he, *by the Faction of* Ithacius,

Dictinius honoured as a Saint.

Priſcillian honoured as a Saint and a Martyr.

g Concil. t. 1. p. 742.
h Concil. t. 2. p. 1279.
i Aug. ad Conc. c. 3.
k Bar. ad ann. 405. n. 56.
l Pet. de Natal. l. 11. c. 89.

being accuſed by ſome as if he had embraced the Hereſy of the Gnoſtics; *but others maintained, that he held not the Doctrine and Tenets with which he was charged* [m]. But being afterwards better informed, he ſtyles him *an execrable Man* [n], and condemns his Doctrine as an *infamous Hereſy*, as a *Plague* and *Contagion*, that cruelly ravaged moſt of the *Spaniſh* Provinces [o]. It is not therefore without Reaſon that the Church of *Rome* now anathematizes, as an Heretic, the Man ſhe once revered as a Saint. Such has been the Fate of many others, judged by *Baronius* himſelf unworthy of the Worſhip that was paid them, and therefore ſet aſide, when, by the Command of *Gregory* XIII. he reviſed and corrected the *Roman Martyrology*. As for *Dictinius*, he has not yet been driven out of Heaven, though nobody can well tell how he came in. 'Tis true, both he and *Symphoſius* are ſtyled *Biſhops of holy Memory*, in the Abſtract of the Council of *Toledo*, which is ſuppoſed to have been done about the Year 447. This is all *Baronius* can plead in favour of his *eminent Sanctity*. A poor Charter indeed to hold a Place in Heaven by, and claim the Worſhip and Honours attending it! For the Author of that Abſtract is utterly unknown; and, beſides, he canonizes alike *Symphoſius* and *Dictinius*, ſtyling them both Biſhops of holy Memory. Why then ſhould his Authority have ſo much Weight with reſpect to the one, and none at all in regard of the other? If we bar Preſcription, which ſurely can have no room here, *Dictinius* can have no more Right to keep the Place he has, than *Symphoſius* to claim the Place he has not. Nay, the latter would have a far better Right, were it true, that *Dictinius* relapſed into the Errors he had abjured, and was on that Account depoſed with ſeveral other Biſhops of his Sect. This I read in an Author of great Note [p]; but as he advances it upon the Authority of another, *viz.* of *Idatius* the Chronologiſt, and the Paſſage he quotes is not to be found in that Writer, at leaſt in the Editions I have peruſed, it would be both unjuſt and ungenerous to deprive *Dictinius* of, or diſturb him in, the Poſſeſſion of his Saintſhip upon ſuch an Evidence.

Syricius and *Ambroſe*, in Conjunction with the Catholic Biſhops of *Spain*, alarmed at the wonderful Progreſs the Doctrine of *Priſcillian* had made in ſo ſhort a Time, left nothing unattempted they could think of to put a Stop to the growing Evil. But all to no Purpoſe; in ſpite of their utmoſt Efforts, in defiance of the moſt ſevere

The Doctrine of the Priſcillianiſts *takes deep Root in* Spain.

[m] Hier. vir. ill. c. 121. [n] Ad Cte. t. 2. p. 152. [o] Id. ep. 82, 29. in Iſai. c. 60. [p] Leo, t. 2. p. 831.

Laws, that were enacted againſt them, eſpecially by the Emperors *Honorius*, and *Theodoſius* the younger, their Numbers increaſed daily, and their Doctrine grew daily more popular; the Severities that were practiſed againſt them, ſerving only to recommend thoſe to the Eſteem and Veneration of the Multitude, who ſuffered them, as many did, with Patience and Conſtancy. As they held it lawful to conceal their real Sentiments from the Catholics, by diſowning them with the moſt ſolemn Oaths; the Catholics ſuffered themſelves to be led by a miſtaken Zeal into the ſame Error, diſowning, in like manner, their Sentiments, the better to diſcover thoſe of their Adverſaries. But this pernicious Practice of *defending Truth by deſtroying it, and oppoſing Lyes by Lying*, was fully and unanſwerably confuted by *Auſtin*, in his Anſwer to *Conſentius*, who had wrote to him at Length upon that Subject [a] (A).

The indefatigable Pains *Syricius* took, together with the other Catholic Biſhops, in ſuppreſſing the Hereſy of the *Priſcillianiſts*, proved quite unſucceſsful, though ſeconded by the Secular Power, and the ſevereſt Laws that had yet been enacted againſt Heretics. Their Doctrine rather gained, than loſt, Ground; and we ſhall find them in the Sixth Century, that is, Two hundred Years hence, ſtill a numerous Sect, and Councils aſſembling, to very little Purpoſe, againſt them. *Syricius* was not ſo intent, as we are told, upon maintaining the Doctrine of the Church, as to neglect the Diſcipline. In order to correct ſeveral Abuſes, that had begun to prevail, and revive

[a] Aug. ad Con. contra mendac. per totum.

(A) The Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, concerning Equivocations, mental Reſervations, and the Lawfulneſs, or rather Obligation, of concealing, with the moſt ſolemn Oaths, what has been revealed under the Seal of Confeſſion, has perhaps ſome Affinity with the Doctrine of the *Priſcillianiſts*. What is only known under the Seal of Confeſſion, ſay their Divines, is not known to Man, but to God alone, ſince it was not diſcovered to a Man, but to God repreſented by a Man, that is, to the Prieſt or Confeſſor; and therefore the Prieſt may, with a ſafe Conſcience, affirm, even upon Oath, that he knows not what he thus knew. 'Tis by recurring to this Doctrine, that F. *Daniel Bartoli*, in his *Hiſtory of* England, or rather of the *Jeſuits* in *England*, endeavours to juſtify the Conduct of the *Jeſuit Garnet*, in not diſcovering the *Gun-powder Plot*, to which he ſuppoſes him to have been privy: But as it was diſcloſed to him in Confeſſion, or at leaſt under the Seal of Confeſſion, he had ſinned grievouſly by diſcovering it, though by ſuch a Diſcovery he might have ſaved a whole Nation from Deſtruction (1). So that the violating ſuch a Seal is a far greater Evil than the Loſs of ſo many Lives, than the utter Ruin of an intire Nation. A Doctrine evidently repugnant to the Dictates both of Reaſon and Humanity.

(1) Bar. hiſt. d'Inghilterra.

ſome

ſome antient Conſtitutions, that were grown out of Uſe, he convened a Council at *Rome*, which is ſaid to have conſiſted of Eighty Biſhops; and, with their Conſent and Approbation, eſtabliſhed the following Canons: 1. That no one ſhould preſume to ordain a Biſhop, without the Knowlege of the *Apoſtolic See*. 2. That no Man ſhould be admitted to the Eccleſiaſtical Order, who, after the Remiſſion of his Sins, that is, perhaps, after his Baptiſm, had worn the Sword of worldly Warfare. 3. That no Clerk ſhould marry a Widow. 4. That the *Novatians* and *Montaniſts*, that is, *Donatiſts*, ſhould be received into the Church by the Impoſition of Hands; but that ſuch as, abandoning the Catholic Faith, had been rebaptized by them, ſhould not be re-admitted without performing a long Penance. 5. That the Prieſts and Deacons ſhould live continent, being, by their Office, daily employed in the Divine Miniſtry [b]. Theſe Canons or Decrees, ſay the Roman Catholic Divines, are contained in a Letter, which *Syricius* wrote to the Biſhops of *Africa*, and which was read, and received as a Law, by a Council held ſome Years after at *Tela*, in the Province of *Byzacene*, as appears from the Acts of that Council [c]. *Ferrandus*, Deacon of *Carthage*, in his Abridgment of the Canons, done in the Sixth Century, often quotes the Letter of *Syricius*, and takes particular Notice of the Canons that were copied from it by the Council of *Tela*. The ſame Letter, together with the Acts of that Council, are to be found, Word for Word, in the antient Code of the Church of *Rome*. So that, upon the Whole, we cannot queſtion, ſays *Baronius*, the Authenticity of that Piece, without rendering the Authority of every other Monument of Antiquity quite precarious, and leaving Men to their own wild and groundleſs Conjectures. But Men of Learning have, of late Years, been too much upon their Guard to admit, without the ſtricteſt Examination, any Piece, however authentic in Appearance, that ſeemed to countenance the extraordinary Power and Authority claimed by the Biſhop of *Rome*. And not without Reaſon, ſince they well knew what Pains had been taken to baniſh Truth, by ſuppreſſing or adulterating the moſt authentic Records, and to eſtabliſh Falſhood, by ſubſtituting in their room fabulous Legends, ſpurious Letters, and Acts of Councils that never were held. As for the Letter aſcribed to *Syricius*, it has been ſuſpected ever ſince Criticiſm took place [d], and lately re-

Council aſſembled by Syricius *at* Rome.

[b] Concil. t. 2. p. 1028—1030. in decretal. epiſt. p. 550.

[c] Concil. t. 2. p. 1578.

[d] Vide Blond. cenſur.

jected, as unqueſtionably ſuppoſititious, by F. *Queſnel*, who, in a learned Diſſertation on that Subject, proves, in my Opinion, unanſwerably, not only the Letter, but the Acts of the pretended Council of *Tela*, to have been forged, and inſerted, in latter Times, into the Collection of *Ferrandus*, and the *Roman* Code [e] (A).

I find

[e] Queſn. diſſert. 5. ſur S. Leon.

(A) To convince the Reader of this double Forgery, I need not refer him to that judicious Writer. The many groundleſs, perplexed, and contradictory Argumen:s, or rather Conjectures, alleged by thoſe who have taken moſt Pains to prove both the above-mentioned Pieces genuine, *viz.* by *Chifflerus*, *Papebrok*, and Cardinal *Noris*, are, perhaps, a more convincing Proof of their being forged, than any that can be alleged againſt them. There is ſo palpable a Difference, in point of Style, between this Letter, and that which *Syricius* wrote to *Himerius*, and which is on all Hands allowed to be genuine, that no one can poſſibly ſuppoſe both to have been penned by one and the ſame Perſon. Beſides, in the former Letter *Syricius* abſolutely commands, and in this only adviſes, exhorts, and intreats the Prieſts and Deacons to live continent. Of theſe Two Difficulties none of the Writers I have juſt quoted have thought fit to take the leaſt Notice, though they could hardly eſcape their Obſervation. The very firſt Canon or Article of this Letter, for the ſake of which both the Letter itſelf, and the Acts of the Council, were moſt probably forged, ſufficiently betrays the Forgery. For it is abſolutely unintelligible, and therefore pointed, conſtrued, altered, *&c.* in Twenty different Manners, by thoſe who maintain it to be genuine. Some read it thus: *Ut ſine conſcientia ſedis Apoſtolicæ Primatis nemo audeat ordinare*; *That no one ſhould preſume to ordain without the Knowlege of the Primate of the Apoſtolic See.* I do not find the Biſhops of *Rome* to have ever ſtyled themſelves, in their Letters, *Primates of the Apoſtolic See*; nay, the humble Title of *Primate of the Apoſtolic See* (humble with reſpect to the Biſhop of *Rome*, Primate, Prince, and Monarch of the whole Church), ſo ſoured *Labbé*, that he fairly owned the Truth, chuſing rather to give up the Letter, than to admit a Title that ſeemed to detract from the *Supremacy*. Beſides, it is very certain, that, in the Time of *Syricius*, the Biſhops of *Rome* were not yet ſo loſt to all Modeſty as to pretend, in open Defiance of the Canons, that no Biſhop ſhould be ordained without their Knowlege. Others read that Article thus: *Ut extra conſcientiam ſedis Apoſtolicæ, hoc eſt, Primatis*, &c. *That none ſhould preſume to ordain without the Knowlege of the Apoſtolic See, that is, of their Primate.* Now, is it probable, that the Biſhop of *Rome* would have given the Title of *Apoſtolic See* to all the Metropolitan Churches; a Title which Pope *Leo the Great* would not allow even to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* (1)? I might add, that the Author of this Letter writes, and I think very ridiculouſly, that the *African* Biſhops would have come to *Rome* to aſſiſt at the Council, had they not been prevented by their Infirmities, or old Age; which is ſuppoſing them all to have been old or infirm; that the Subſcription of this Letter is very ſingular, *Data Romæ in Concilio Epiſcoporum octoginta*, which in all other Synodal Letters is placed at the Beginning; that neither this Letter, nor the Council of *Tela*, by which it is ſuppoſed to have been quoted, are ever mentioned or taken notice of by any of the Councils, that were afterwards held in *Africa*, to eſtabliſh the Celibacy of the Clergy. Some will have this Letter to have been written only for the Biſhops of the Vicariate of *Rome*, of which *Syricius* was Primate, and to have been ſent by him to the Biſhops of *Africa*, and perhaps to thoſe of the other Provinces, with a Deſign to try whether they might not be prompted to receive the Canons it contained, as general Rules, though made

(1) Leo, ep. 78.

for

I find no farther Mention made of *Syricius*, in the antient Writers, till the Year 390. when he condemned the Doctrine of *Jovinian*, and caſt him and his Followers out of the Church. *Jovinian* was by Profeſſion a Monk, by Birth a *Latin*, as *Jerom* obſerves, and the firſt who infected that Language with Hereſy; all, or rather almoſt all, the Hereſies that, for the firſt Four hundred Years, had diſturbed the Peace of the Church, having been broached by *Greeks*, *Chaldæans*, or *Syrians* f. He had formerly practiſed great Auſterities, going barefooted, living upon Bread and Water, covered with a tattered black Garment, and earning his Livelihood with the Sweat of his Brows, his Hands being callous with long and hard Labour g. The Doctrine he taught is, by *Jerom*, reduced to the Four following Heads. 1. That thoſe who, with a lively Faith, have been regenerated by Baptiſm, cannot afterwards be overcome by the Devil. 2. That for all thoſe, who ſhall preſerve their Baptiſm, an equal Reward is reſerved in Hea-

f Hier. in Jovin. l. 2. t. 2. p. 94. g Id. ib. l. 1. c. 25. Aug. hæreſ. 82. Amb. ep. 7.

for the Vicariate only. This had been attempting to eſtabliſh at once, and in a manner by Surprize, an univerſal Juriſdiction. But I can hardly believe, that, in the Days of *Syricius*, when the Ambition of the Biſhops of *Rome* was yet in its Infancy, they ſhould have aſpired to, or entertained any Notion of, ſuch a Juriſdiction. As to the Council, I ſhall only obſerve here, that it is ſaid in all the printed Copies of the Councils, all the antient Manuſcripts, but one, to have been held at *Tela*, in the Province of *Byzacene*, whereas *Tela* is allowed, even by thoſe who defend this Council as genuine, to have belonged to the *Proconſularis*. They have therefore nothing elſe to recur to but the Ignorance of the Tranſcribers, the uſual Refuge in ſuch Caſes, whom they all agree to have been miſtaken, though all equally at a Loſs, and at Variance among themſelves, how to correct the ſuppoſed Miſtake. For, inſtead of *Tela*, ſome read *Zela* or *Zella*, others *Tena*, *Teneptis*, *Teleptus*, &c. In ſhort there is not a ſingle Town in the whole Province of *Byzacene*, bearing the leaſt Reſemblance in Name with *Tela*, that has not been ſubſtituted in its room; nay, ſome have beſtowed that Honour on the ſmalleſt Villages, as if it were probable, that, in a Province, filled, as *Byzacene* was, with conſiderable Cities, and Epiſcopal Sees, Biſhops ſhould chuſe to aſſemble in a Village. To read *Proconſularis* inſtead of *Byzacene*, as ſome have done, is contradicting, and conſequently giving up, the Acts of that Council; for the Thirty-three Biſhops named there, as compoſing it, were all of the latter Province, and *Vincentius* and *Fortunatianus* are ſaid to have aſſiſted as Deputies from the former (2). It would be needleſs to dwell any longer on this Subject, and point out the many Abſurdities and Contradictions that occur in the ſuppoſed Acts of that Council, ſince the very Title muſt convince every impartial Reader, that no ſuch Council was ever held. I cannot, however, help taking notice of a very extraordinary Canon, quoted by *Ferrandus*, from the Letter of *Syricius*, and approved, as is ſaid there, by the Council of *Tela*; *viz.* That *no Biſhop ſhould be ordained by a ſingle Biſhop, the Church of* Rome *excepted.* This Exception is not to be found in the Letter aſcribed to *Syricius*, from which they make *Ferrandus* quote it; and, beſides, the Biſhops of *Rome* were never ordained by a ſingle Biſhop, nor did they ever take upon them to ordain Biſhops alone.

(2) Concil. t. 1. p. 1577.

ven.

ven. 3. That there is no Difference of Merit between abſtaining from ſome Meats, and uſing them with Thankſgiving. 4. and laſtly, That Virgins, Widows, and married Women, are in a State of equal Merit; and, conſequently, that all Difference in Merit can only ariſe from their different Actions. That the Two laſt were then counted Hereſies, ſhews that the Church began, in this Century, to be tainted with Doctrines that border on Popery, and no-ways conſiſt with the Liberty of the Goſpel [h]. Beſides theſe Tenets, that *Jovinian* taught, as *Ambroſe* and *Auſtin* inform us, that the Virgin *Mary* preſerved her Virginity in conceiving our *Saviour*, but loſt it in bringing him forth, pretending to prove by Arguments, *falſe, but ingenious enough*, ſay they, that we ſhould otherwiſe be obliged to own, with the *Manichees*, the Body of *Chriſt* not to have been real, but aereal [i]. He, beſides, charged the Catholics with *Manicheiſm*, on account of their preferring the State of Virginity to that of Matrimony [k]. Both *Jerom* and *Ambroſe* tell us, that, together with his Doctrine, he changed his Manners, renouncing his former Auſterities, and giving himſelf up to all manner of Debauchery, to redeem, as it were, the Time he had loſt [l]. But perhaps this Charge was not well founded, but rather ſuppoſed as a Conſequence of his undervaluing Celibacy, and the Merit aſcribed to it, there being too many Inſtances in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of ſuch Inferences, drawn from Opinions which were not approved by the Fathers of the Church, as could no-way be juſtified. They often painted thoſe, whom they ſtyled Heretics in the blackeſt Colours, to prejudice the People more effectually againſt their Doctrine. In this Art *Jerom* excelled all the reſt, and none ever diſagreed with him, who did not at once forfeit thoſe very Virtues, which he himſelf had admired and extolled in them before. He abſtained, however, from Matrimony; but merely, ſay *Auſtin* and *Jerom*, to avoid the Trouble and Anxiety attending it, and not becauſe he apprehended there could be in this Life any Merit in Continency, or any Reward allotted for it in the next [m]. This Doctrine he broached in *Rome*, and ſoon found there a great Number of Followers, among the reſt ſeveral of both Sexes, who had embraced, and profeſſed for many Years, the State of Virginity, being ſeduced and miſled, ſays *Auſtin*, by the Cavils of that impious Wretch, asking them, whe-

[h] Hier. ib. c. 1. [i] Aug. op. imp. l. 4. c. 121. & hær. 82. Amb. ep. 7. [k] Aug. in Jul. l. 2. c. 2. & ad Bon. l. 2. c. 2. [l] Hier. ib. c. 25. Amb. ep. 7. [m] Amb. ibid.

ther they pretended to be more holy than *Abraham* and *Sarah*, than many other Men and Women, who, though married, are commended in the *Old Teſtament*, for their eminent Sanctity [n]. The firſt, who took Offence at this Doctrine, were Two Laymen, *viz. Pammachius* and *Victorinus*. All we know of the latter is, that he was illuſtrious for his Birth, and, if we believe *Ambroſe*, venerable for his Piety [o]. As for *Pammachius*, he is well known in the Hiſtory of the Church, and often mentioned by *Jerom* with the greateſt Commendations. He was deſcended, ſays that Writer, from the antient Family of the *Camilli*, and yet leſs diſtinguiſhed by the Nobility of his Deſcent than his Piety [p]. Having heard, by Chance, ſome of the Propoſitions advanced by *Jovinian*, he made it his Buſineſs to inquire more narrowly into his Doctrine, being aſſiſted therein by *Victorinus*, who had taken the Alarm upon hearing, in *Rome*, this *ſhocking Doctrine*, ſays *Jerom* [q], that *a Virgin was no better than a married Woman*. Theſe Two having, by a diligent Inquiry, diſcovered at length the whole Doctrine of *Jovinian*, as well as the Author and Promoters of it, they preſented a Requeſt to *Syricius*, acquainting him therewith, and deſiring, that the Doctrine of *Jovinian* might be condemned by the Epiſcopal Authority, and the Sentence of the *Holy Ghoſt*, as contrary to the Law of God [r]. Theſe are *Ambroſe*'s Words, as the Text now is; but it is generally thought to have been altered and corrupted. Be that as it will, *Syricius* did not take upon him to act on this Occaſion by his private Authority; but, aſſembling the Prieſts, Deacons, and other Eccleſiaſtics of *Rome*, he read to them the Requeſt of *Pammachius* and *Victorinus*, and having, together with them, maturely examined the Doctrine of *Jovinian*, he declared it, with the unanimous Conſent of the whole Aſſembly contrary to Scripture; and at the ſame time cut off, for ever, from the Communion of the Church, not only *Jovinian*, who had firſt broached ſuch a Doctrine, but thoſe among his Followers, who were found to have been the moſt ſanguine in promoting it; *viz. Auxentius*, *Genialis*, *Germinator*, *Felix*, *Frontinus*, *Martianus*, *Januarius*, and *Ingenius* [s]. *Jovinian*, inſtead of acquieſcing to the Judgment of *Syricius*, and his Clergy, immediately left *Rome*, and repaired with all Speed to *Milan*, not deſpairing of being able to engage *Ambroſe* in his Favour, and likewiſe the Emperor *Theodoſius*, who was then in that City, before

The Doctrine of Jovinian *condemned by a Council at* Rome.

[n] Aug. hæreſ. 82. Hier. in Jovin. l. 2. c. 23. [o] Amb. ep. 6. [p] Hier. ep. 26. [q] Id. ep. 50. [r] Amb. ep. 6. [s] Id. ib.

Syricius

Syricius could prejudice them againſt him. Of this *Syricius* was aware, and therefore, without Loſs of Time, diſpatched Three of his Presbyters to *Milan*, *Creſcentius*, *Leopardus* and *Alexander*, with a Letter to that Church, which has been tranſmitted to us among *Ambroſe*'s Works [t], acquainting them with what had paſſed at *Rome*. In virtue of this Letter they were rejected by *Ambroſe*; and, at the Requeſt of Three *Roman* Presbyters, driven out of the Town by the Emperor (A).

The Letter of *Syricius* was anſwered by *Ambroſe*, and ſigned by him, and ſeveral other Biſhops, who were ſtill at *Milan*, where they had met to condemn *Ithacius*, and his Adherents, for having been acceſſary to the Death of *Priſcillian*. In their Anſwer they commend the Paſtoral Vigilance of *Syricius*, and, having briefly declared their Opinion againſt the other Tenets of *Jovinian*, dwell on what he had advanced againſt the Virginity of the Virgin *Mary*. But they ſeem to have miſtaken his Meaning, in charging him with *Manicheiſm*, and ſuppoſing him to have held, that our Saviour did not aſſume a real Body: for he held no ſuch Doctrine, but only charged the Catholics with it, as *Auſtin* tells us in expreſs Terms [u]. It is ſurpriſing, that ſuch a Queſtion ſhould have thus employed the Thoughts and Attention of ſo many venerable Prelates, and created ſuch Feuds and Animoſities in the Church. Both Parties agreed, that the Virgin *Mary* had brought forth her Son without the Co-operation or Intercourſe of Man; and in that Senſe alone ſhe is ſtyled a Virgin.

From *Milan* *Jovinian* returned to the Neighbourhood of *Rome*, where his Followers continued to aſſemble, under his Direction, till the Year 398. when the Emperor *Honorius*, giving Ear to the Complaints of the neighbouring Biſhops, enacted a Law, commanding him and his Accomplices to be beaten with Whips armed with Lead, and tranſported into different Iſlands [w]. *Jovinian* himſelf was confined to the Iſle of *Boas*, on the Coaſt of *Dalmatia* [x], where he gave up the Ghoſt, about the Year 406. in the midſt of the Mirth and Jollity

Law enacted againſt Jovinian, *and his Followers.*

[t] Id. ep. 7. [u] Aug. in Jul. l. 1. c. 2. [w] Cod. Theod. 16. t. 5. l. 53.
[x] Hier. in Vigil. c. 1.

(A) *Baronius* pretends it was on this Occaſion that *Theodoſius* enacted the Law, dated from *Verona* the 3d of *September* of the preſent Year 390. commanding all, who profeſſed a monaſtic Life, to quit the Cities, and retire, purſuant to their Profeſſion, into the Deſerts (1). But that it was made on a very different Occaſion, it will fall in my way to ſhew hereafter.

(1) Bar. ad ann. 390. n. 47, 48.

of

of a Banquet, ſays *Jerom*, adding, that he was revived in *Vigilantius*, as *Euphorbus* was formerly in *Pythagoras* [y]. Some of *Jerom*'s Friends in *Rome* ſent him the Book, which *Jovinian* had compoſed to explain and defend his Doctrine, begging him to confute it. He readily complied with their Requeſt, and ended his Work in the Year 392. It conſiſted of Two Books, but met with a very indifferent Reception at *Rome*. For though he declared from the Beginning, that it was not his Intention to condemn Marriage, and that he had an utter Abhorrence to the Errors of *Marcion*, of *Tatian*, and the *Manichees*, holding Marriage to be ſinful; yet the diſparaging Terms he made uſe of in ſpeaking of Marriage, gave great Offence, even to thoſe who profeſſed Continency (A).

Notwithſtanding the Severity of the Law I have mentioned above, ſome ſtill continued to hold, and privately to propagate, the Doctrine of *Jovinian*, which induced *Auſtin* to compoſe his Treatiſe on the Advantages of Marriage and Virginity; a Performance far more judicious than that of *Jerom*, who has taken great pains to diſparage and cry down Marriage, the better to extol Virginity, as if he could not commend the one without condemning the other. *Auſtin*, on the contrary, begins his Work with great Encomiums on Matrimony, to which, however commendable, in the End he prefers Virginity. But after all, the Reaſons alleged by the one as well as the other, are, if duly weighed, but empty and unconcluſive Speculations.

New Diſturbances in the Church of Antioch.

The following Year, 391. a great Council was convened at *Capua*, chiefly with a View to reſtore Peace to the Church of *Antioch*, and put an End to the Schiſm, which had long prevailed there, and had occaſioned almoſt an intire Separation between the Eaſt and the Weſt, as I have related elſewhere [a]. *Paulinus*, who was acknowleged for lawful Biſhop of that City by Part of the Catholics there, by the Biſhops of *Egypt*, *Arabia*, *Cyprus*, by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and all

[y] Hier. in Vigil. c. 1.

[a] Vide p. 220.

(A) This induced *Pammachius* to purchaſe all the Copies of it he could get, and ſend them back to the Author, acquainting him in a friendly manner with what had chiefly given Offence (1). This *Jerom* took as a Token of the moſt ſincere Friendſhip; and therefore, not ſatisfied with acknowleging the Obligation he had laid on him, and commending his Conduct as worthy of his great Prudence, and anſwerable to the Affection which it was owing to, he immediately ſet about the Apology which *Pammachius* had adviſed him to write, and inſcribed it to him (2).

(1) Ex Ruff. p. 231. & ep. 52.

(2) Hier. ep. 51, 52.

the Weſtern Biſhops, died about the Year 388 [b]. But the unhappy Diviſion, which had reigned during his Life, continued to reign even after his Death. For *Paulinus*, by a moſt unaccountable Conduct, and a moſt notorious and open Violation of the Canons, took upon him not only to appoint himſelf a Succeſſor before he died, but to ordain him alone. The Perſon whom he thus both named and ordained, was one *Evagrius*, a Presbyter, with whom he had always lived in cloſe Friendſhip [c]; and who, on that Account was, notwithſtanding his illegal Election and Ordination, acknowleged by *Paulinus*'s Party for Biſhop of *Antioch*. *Theodoret* writes, that the Biſhop of *Rome*, with the other Weſtern Biſhops, and thoſe of *Egypt*, embraced his Communion [d]. But *Ambroſe* aſſures us, that the Biſhops of *Egypt* ſtood neuter, ſuſpending all Communication both with *Evagrius*, and his Competitor *Flavianus*; and ſpeaks in ſuch manner of both, as gives us room to ſuppoſe that he himſelf communicated with neither. *Both rely more on the Invalidity of their Competitor's Ordination*, ſays he, *than on the Validity of their own. It is therefore with Reaſon that* Flavianus *declines a fair Trial, and not without Reaſon that* Evagrius *does not demand one* [e]. The Example of *Ambroſe* was, in all Likelihood, followed by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and the other Weſtern Biſhops; or *Ambroſe*, perhaps, conformed to theirs (A).

All the Biſhops of *Illyricum*, upon the Death of *Paulinus*, admitted *Flavianus*, and not *Evagrius*, to their Communion, if we may depend upon *Theodoret* [f]. As this new Election occaſioned unheard-of Diſturbances in the Church of *Antioch*, as the Diviſion ſtill continued between the Eaſt and the Weſt, the Weſtern Biſhops had frequent Recourſe to the Emperor *Theodoſius*, during the Three Years he paſſed in the Weſt, preſſing him to oblige, by his Imperial Authority, both *Flavianus* and *Evagrius* to ſubmit their Cauſe to the Judgment of a

[b] Soz. l. 5. c. 15. & l. 7. c. 15. Hier. vir. ill. c. 125. [c] Theodor. l. 5. c. 25.
[d] Theod. ib. [e] Amb. ep. 9. [f] Theod. ib.

(A) A modern Writer will have it by all means, that *Syricius* communicated with *Evagrius* (1), becauſe he had always oppoſed *Flavianus*, as his Predeceſſors had done. But ſurely from his eſpouſing the Cauſe of *Paulinus*, who was legally choſen, againſt *Flavianus*, whoſe Election was conteſted, we cannot well conclude, that, in Oppoſition to him, he likewiſe took the Part of one whoſe Election was indiſputably illegal. It is far more probable, that he communicated with neither.

(1) M. Launoy, ep. 7. p. 10.

Council,

Council, that ſhould be held in *Italy*. *Theodoſius* conſented at laſt to their Requeſt, named *Capua* for the Place where the Council ſhould meet, and took upon him to oblige *Flavianus* to repair thither at the Time appointed. Soon after, that is about the 14th of *July* 391. he left *Italy*, where he had continued ever ſince the Year 388. ſettling young *Valentinian* on the Throne, and ſet out for *Conſtantinople*, into which City he made his Entry on the 10th of *November*. Before his Departure from *Italy* he had wrote to *Flavianus*, commanding him to repair to *Conſtantinople*, and wait his Arrival there. *Flavianus* readily complied with the Emperor's Orders, and appeared at Court the Day after his Arrival. But when the Prince acquainted him with the Promiſe he had made to the Weſtern Biſhops, and deſired him to prepare for the Journey, which he did in a very obliging Manner, *Flavianus* repreſented to him the Inconveniencies attending ſo long a Journey at that Seaſon of the Year, and begged he would give him Leave to put it off to the Spring, when he would not fail to obey his Orders. The Emperor, ſeeing him ſtricken in Years, thought the Excuſe juſt and reaſonable; and therefore, out of Compaſſion and Good-nature, allowed him for the preſent to return to his See [g]. Thus did *Flavianus*, by the Indulgence of the Emperor, avoid the Judgment of the Weſtern Biſhops, who wiſely forbore meddling with ſo nice a Subject in his Abſence, though his Competitor was preſent.

The Council of *Capua* met in the Latter-end of the Year 391. and was, it ſeems, a very numerous Aſſembly, ſince it is ſtyled, in the Canons of the Church of *Africa*, *a full Council* [h]. But whether it was compoſed of all the Weſtern Biſhops, or only of the Biſhops of *Italy*, is uncertain, and cannot be determined from the Words of *Ambroſe*, *We all met* [i], which may be equally underſtood of both. As the Acts of this Council have not reached our Times, we do not even know who preſided at it, ſome conferring that Honour on *Ambroſe* [k], ſome on *Syricius* [l], and ſome on both [m]. That *Syricius* preſided, or even aſſiſted, in Perſon, is not at all probable; for in the Times I am now writing of, the Biſhops of *Rome* had begun to affect Grandeur; and, under Pretence that their Preſence was neceſſary in the great Metropolis of the Empire, to aſſiſt or preſide in Councils held elſewhere by their Deputies or Legates, as they are now ſtyled.

The Council of Capua.

[g] Id. ib. & Amb. 9. [h] Concil. t. 2. p. 1072. [i] Amb. ep. 9. [k] Laun. ep. 7. p. 10. [l] Bar. ad ann. 391. [m] Blond. primaut. p. 237.

That *Syricius* aſſiſted, by his Deputies, at the Council of *Capua*, I do not doubt, ſince the Council was compoſed, at leaſt, of all the Biſhops of *Italy*, and *Syricius* owned himſelf bound by their Decrees [z]. But that *Ambroſe* preſided, ſeems undeniable, ſince by him, and him alone, the Whole was conducted and managed (A).

The Council avoided deciding, and even taking into Conſideration, the Affair of *Flavianus* and *Evagrius*, in the Abſence of the former, though they had chiefly met for that Purpoſe. However, to re-eſtabliſh the Tranquillity of the Church, they agreed to renew their Correſpondence with, and grant their Communion to, all the Catholic Biſhops of the Eaſt. As for the Difference between the Two Competitors for the See of *Antioch*, they committed the diſcuſſing and deciding it to *Theophylus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and the other Biſhops of *Egypt*, as the moſt proper Judges, ſince they communicated with neither, and therefore could not be ſuſpected to favour the one more than the other [a]. The Biſhop of *Alexandria* immediately acquainted *Flavianus* with the Reſolution of the Council, ſummoning him, at the ſame time, to appear, in Compliance therewith, before the Biſhops of *Egypt*, who were ſoon to aſſemble, in order to put the Decree of that venerable Aſſembly in Execution. But *Flavianus*, inſtead of obeying the Summons, and paying the Regard that was thought due to the Decree of ſo numerous a Council, refuſed to ſtir from *Antioch*, pleading a Reſcript, which he had extorted from *Theodoſius*, commanding the Weſtern Biſhops to repair into the Eaſt, and there examine the Affair in a new Council. This *Theophylus* did not expect, and therefore being at a Loſs how to conduct himſelf on ſuch an Emergency, he gave *Ambroſe* immediate Notice of the Summons he had ſent, and the Anſwer he had received. *Ambroſe* had nothing ſo much at Heart as to reſtore Peace and Tranquillity to the Church of *Antioch*; and from the Regard which the Council had ſhewn to *Flavianus*, as well as the Impartiality with which they had acted with reſpect to both, he had promiſed himſelf Succeſs in ſo pious an Undertaking. It was therefore with the ut-

The Difference between the Two Competitors to the See of Antioch *referred, by the Council, to the Biſhops of* Egypt.

Flavianus *refuſes to comply with the Decree of the Council.*

[z] Amb. ep. 9. [a] Id. ib.

(A) *Baronius*, without the leaſt Foundation in Hiſtory, ſuppoſes *Ambroſe* to have acted as the Pope's Legate. But it is the Cuſtom of that Writer to veſt every eminent and diſtinguiſhed Prelate with the Legatine Dignity on ſuch Occaſions, and then paſs upon his Readers the Deference and Regard ſhewn to their Merit for a Tribute paid to the Biſhops of *Rome*.

moſt

moſt Concern that he ſaw his Endeavours thus unexpectedly defeated, and all Hopes of accompliſhing what he had undertaken, vaniſh at once. He had but too much Reaſon to reſent ſuch an affronting Conduct, which did not ſo much affect the Council in general, as him in particular, ſince it was at his Motion, that the Council took the above-mentioned Reſolution. That, however, did not tempt him to depart from the Neutrality he had embraced, and declare for *Evagrius:* he ſtill maintained the ſame Impartiality, and refuſed to communicate with either. In his Anſwer to *Theophylus*, he deſires him, without betraying the leaſt Emotion of Anger or Reſentment, to ſummon *Flavianus* once more, directing him, at the ſame time, to communicate with all the Catholic Biſhops of the Eaſt, purſuant to the Decree of the Council, whether he complied with this Second Summons or no; and to acquaint the Biſhop of *Rome* with what he had done, that, the Whole being approved by that Church, as he did not queſtion but it would, the whole Church might be happily of one Mind, and reap the Fruit of his Labour [b].

Ambroſe's *Moderation and Impartiality.*

Syricius, and in all Likelihood *Ambroſe* too, wrote to *Theodoſius*, preſſing him to ſend *Flavianus* to *Rome* (B), if he did not approve of his being judged by the Biſhop of *Alexandria*. *Syricius*, in his Letter, tells the Emperor, that he well knew how to deal with Tyrants, who revolted from him, and how to chaſtiſe them; but ſuffered thoſe to go unpuniſhed, who deſpiſed the Laws of *Chriſt* [c] (C).

Syricius *writes to the Emperor.*

Theodoſius, in Compliance with the Requeſt of *Syricius*, made in the Name of all the Weſtern Biſhops, ſent anew for *Flavianus*, and told him, that he muſt, by all means, either repair to *Rome*, or ſubmit his Cauſe to the Judgment of the Biſhops of *Egypt*. But he was determined, ſays *Theodoret*, to relinquiſh his Dignity rather than to ſuffer the Weſtern Biſhops, or thoſe of *Egypt*, to examine and decide whether he had a Right to it or no; and, by that means, to hold it of them. He therefore anſwered the Emperor, with great Calmneſs and Reſpect, in the following Terms: *Sir, if my Faith is not thought Orthodox, or my Conduct not worthy of a Catholic Biſhop,*

Flavianus *ready to reſign his Dignity, rather than to ſubmit to the Judgment of the* Egyptian *or Weſtern Biſhops.*

[b] Id. ib. [c] Theod. l. 5. c. 23.

(B) That is, into the Weſt; for thus *Theodoret* conſtantly expreſſes the Weſt.

(C) *Theodoret* tells us, that *Damaſus*, *Syricius*, and *Anaſtaſius* the Succeſſor of *Syricius*, wrote to the Emperor *Theodoſius* about the Diſpute between *Flavianus* and *Evagrius*. A groſs Miſtake! ſince *Damaſus* was dead long before the Election of *Evagrius*, and *Theodoſius* before that of *Anaſtaſius*.

ſhop,

ſhop, I am willing to be judged by thoſe who accuſe me, and ready to ſubmit to the Sentence they ſhall pronounce. But, if all this Noiſe is made merely for the ſake of my Dignity, from this Moment I reſign every Preferment I enjoy in the Church, to thoſe whom nothing but Preferment can ſilence. You may therefore diſpoſe of the See of Antioch, *now vacant, to whom you pleaſe. Theodoſius*, pleaſed with this Anſwer, and thinking *Flavianus*, the more ready he was to give up his Dignity, the more worthy to hold it, ordered him to return to *Antioch*, and reſume the Government of his Church; nor did he ever afterwards give the leaſt Attention to the preſſing and repeated Inſtances of *Syricius*, and his Collegues in the Weſt [d].

Flavianus *did not acknowlege in* Syricius *the Power claimed by his Succeſſors.*

From the whole Conduct of *Flavianus* it is manifeſt, that he did not acknowlege any extraordinary Power in *Syricius*, much leſs that Power, which has been claimed by his Succeſſors, of diſpoſing, by Divine Right, of all Biſhopricks, of placing and diſplacing Biſhops, at Pleaſure, throughout the Chriſtian World. This Power, though evidently uſurped, and utterly unknown even in the End of the Fourth Century, Biſhops are now obliged to own in their very Titles, ſtyling themſelves Biſhops of ſuch a Place, *by the Grace of God, and of the Apoſtolic See*. *Flavianus* was content with *the Grace of God*; and, as for the *Grace of the Apoſtolic See*, he gave himſelf no Trouble about it. And yet *Flavianus* is honoured by the Church of *Rome* as a Saint; and his Feſtival kept on the 26th of *September*. And truly, if we may depend upon the Teſtimony of the moſt authentic and unexceptionable Writers of thoſe Times, we ſhall hardly find one in the *Roman* Calendar more worthy of that Honour. The famous *John Chryſoſtom*, who was one of his Presbyters before his Promotion to the See of *Conſtantinople*, has filled his Homilies with the Praiſes of *the great Flavianus*, as he ſtyles him. His diſtinguiſhed Merit, eminent Virtues, and extraordinary Piety, ſeem to have been *Chryſoſtom*'s favourite Topic; and theſe Encomiums he beſtowed upon him, while he was ſtill alive. After his Death he was diſtinguiſhed by the Council of *Chalcedon*, with the Title of *the bleſſed Flavianus* [e]; and by that of the Eaſt, held under *John* of *Antioch*, ranked among the brighteſt Luminaries, the moſt illuſtrious Prelates, and the greateſt Saints of the Church [f]. *Theodoret* never names him without adding to his Name ſome Epithet, denoting his extraordinary Merit, ſuch as

[d] Id. ib. [e] Concil. t. 4. p. 830. [f] Facund. Hermian. l. 8. c. 1.

the

the great, *the holy*, *the admirable* Flavianus. As therefore no room is left to doubt of his extraordinary Piety and Merit, we may well conclude, from his abſolutely refuſing to ſubmit his Cauſe to the Judgment of *Syricius*, and the other Biſhops of the Weſt, that he did not acknowlege either in him or them a Power to judge him. This Refuſal did not, in the Eyes of *Chryſoſtom* and other great Men, detract in the leaſt from his Merit, nor leſſen the high Opinion they entertained of his Sanctity. A plain Indication that they did not think his Conduct reprehenſible, and conſequently did not acknowlege, more than he, that Power which is now one main Article of the *Roman Catholic Creed*.

The Communion betw. en the Eaſt and the Weſt renewed.

As *Flavianus* declined the Judgment of the *Weſtern* as well as the *Egyptian* Biſhops, and the Emperor gave no farther Ear to their Remonſtrances and Complaints, the Reſolution taken by the Council of *Capua* was put in Execution; which was to renew the Communion and good Underſtanding between the Eaſt and the Weſt, and abandon the Church of *Antioch* to its Schiſm, which, after ſo many promiſing Remedies applied in vain, began now to be deemed an incurable Evil [g].

Bonoſus *accuſed before the Council.*

The Council of *Capua*, after the above-mentioned Reſolution concerning the Difference between *Flavianus* and *Evagrius*, heard a Charge brought by ſome Biſhops againſt *Bonoſus*, Biſhop of *Naiſſus* in *Dacia*, according to ſome, or, as others will have it, of *Sardica*, the Metropolis of that Province. He was accuſed of a Crime againſt the Canons of the Church and the Law of God [h], and likewiſe of Hereſy. The Crime is not ſpecified; but as for the Hereſy, I gather from *Auſtin*, that he held the Son to be inferior to the Father [i]; and from *Ambroſe*, that he taught, the Virgin *Mary* had had other Children after the Birth of *Chriſt* [k]. He had, it ſeems, been condemned by *Damaſus*, who died in 384 [l], but ſtill held his See, and was not driven from it even by the Council of *Capua*. For the Fathers of that Aſſembly committed the hearing and judging of his Cauſe to the Biſhops in his Neighbourhood, chiefly to thoſe of *Macedon*, under their Metropolitan *Anyſius*, Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* [m]. The neighbouring Biſhops aſſembled, purſuant to the Order of the Council; and *Bonoſus*, as well as his Accuſers, appearing before them, they found the Charge ſo well ſupported, that they immediately forbid him to enter his Church; which was ſuſpending him

His Errors.

The judging of his Cauſe committed by the Council to the neighbouring Biſhops, who condemn him.

[g] Ruff. l. 11. c. 22. [h] Mercat. t. 2. p. 128. [i] Aug. ep. 150. [k] Amb. ep. 5. & Inſtit. Virg. p. 5. [l] Merc. ib. [m] Amb. ib.

from all Epiſcopal Functions. *Bonoſus* complained loudly of this Sentence, and even adviſed with the Biſhop of *Milan*, whether he might not, in Defiance of a Judgment ſo raſh and immature, ſtill exerciſe the Functions of his Office, and, in caſe of Oppoſition, repel Force with Force. *Ambroſe* exhorted him, in the ſtrongeſt Terms, to acquieſce to the Sentence, to conduct himſelf with the Prudence, Temper, and Moderation, that became a Biſhop; and, above all, not to undertake any thing that might be interpreted as a Contempt of the Authority of his Judges, ſince he could not contemn their Authority, without contemning at the ſame time that of the Council, which had appointed them [n]. In the mean time the Biſhops of *Macedon*, having more leiſurely examined the Cauſe of *Bonoſus*, wrote to *Syricius*, referring the Deciſion to him, and declaring their *Abhorrence of the deteſtable Error, that the Virgin* Mary *had other Children beſides Chriſt*. If this was an Error, which may well be doubted, it was one that did no way affect the Chriſtian Faith, and therefore did not deſerve ſuch a ſevere Condemnation: but as it thwarted the favourable Opinions then entertained in the Church concerning Virginity, it is no Wonder that it ſhould meet with ſo rough a Treatment (A).

Syricius,

[n] Id. ib.

(A) That the Virgin *Mary* had other Children beſides Chriſt, was not a new Opinion. It was taught by *Helvidius* in 383. and long before him by *Tertullian*, as *Jerom* himſelf is forced to own in the Treatiſe which he wrote againſt *Helvidius*: nay, in the Time of *Epiphanius*, who flouriſhed from the Year 366. to 403. that Opinion univerſally prevailed in *Arabia*, as appears from the Letter which he wrote in Confutation of it, and addreſſed to all the Chriſtians dwelling in *Arabia*, from the Presbyters down to the Catechumens. In that Letter he ſtyles thoſe who denied the perpetual Virginity of the Virgin *Mary*, *Antidicomarianites*; and ranks them, though their Opinion had not yet been condemned by the Church, ſometimes among the Heretics, and ſometimes among the Schiſmatics. But in the ſame Letter he cenſures, with no leſs Severity, thoſe who adored her, ſtyling the Worſhip that was paid her *an idolatrous Hereſy*, which was taxing thoſe who paid it both with Hereſy and Idolatry; and from neither will the unmeaning Terms of *Latria*, *Dulia*, *Hyperdulia*, &c. invented and uſed by the Schoolmen to expreſs different Degrees of Worſhip, excuſe the preſent Practice of the Church of *Rome*. *Epiphanius* was unacquainted with ſuch Terms, as well as with the different Degrees of Worſhip anſwering them; and therefore called the Meeting of certain Women, on a ſtated Day, to offer a Cake to the Virgin *Mary*, and eat it together in her Honour (whence they had the Name of *Collyridians*) *a Folly repugnant to Religion, an Illuſion of the Devil, a robbing God of the Honour that was due to him, an idolatrous Hereſy* (1). Theſe Women came from the Northern Provinces of *Scythia* into *Thrace*, probably about the Year 372. when *Athanaric* King of the *Goths* drove all the Chriſtians out of his Dominions. From *Thrace* they wandered into *Arabia*; and there, in Oppoſition to the *Antidicomarianites*, introduced the above-mentioned idolatrous Practice. This is the firſt Inſtance

(1) Epiph. hær. 78, 79.

Syricius, in his Anſwer to the Biſhops of *Macedon*, approves their Sentiments; and employs almoſt his whole Letter to ſhew, that the Virgin *Mary* was always a Virgin: but as for the Cauſe of *Bonoſus*, he tells them, that *it was not lawful for him to judge it, ſince that Province had been committed to them by the Council of* Capua [o]. And was not this diſclaiming, in the moſt plain and explicit Terms he poſſibly could, that Power which his Succeſſors challenge, and have almoſt overturned the Chriſtian Religion to maintain (A)?

[o] Amb. ibid.

of any Worſhip paid to the Virgin *Mary*; and to thoſe Women the extravagant Worſhip that is ſtill paid her by the Church of *Rome*, owes its Riſe. Some of theſe Women took upon them to act, at their Meetings, as Prieſteſſes. This *Epiphanius* ſtyles an abominable Abuſe, Women being ſo utterly incapable, ſays he, of performing any Eccleſiaſtical Functions, that our Saviour did not grant even to his Mother the Power of baptizing (9).

(A) Such a Letter, we may be ſure, has not been tamely received by the Partiſans of *Rome*. Some of them have rejected it as forged and ſurreptitious, for no other Reaſon, but becauſe *Syricius* is there made to diſclaim a Power which he undoubtedly had. But this is evidently begging the Queſtion (1). Others, finding it conveyed to us amongſt *Ambroſe*'s Letters, have aſcribed it to him, by prefixing his Name to it. But *Ambroſe* is unluckily named, and ſpoken of, in the Body of the Letter: whence *Baronius* himſelf allows it not to be his (2). The Style afforded great Matter of Diſpute, ſome thinking it like, and others unlike, to the Style of *Syricius*; but more than the Style, the Title; *To* Theophylus *and* Anyſius. The former was Biſhop of *Alexandria*: And how came he to be any-ways concerned in the Cauſe of *Bonoſus*? If that Name was common to him with ſome Biſhops of *Macedon*, how came that Biſhop to be named before *Anyſius* his Metropolitan (3)? In the Height of theſe Diſputes, *Holſtenius* publiſhed the above-mentioned Letter at *Rome*, under the Name of *Syricius*, from a very antient and authentic Manuſcript, with the following Title, *To* Anyſius *and the other Biſhops of* Illyricum (4). This turned the Controverſy into another Chanel; for the Diſpute was no more concerning the Authenticity, but the Senſe, of the Letter, which the Sticklers for the See of *Rome* began to think very different from the Senſe that the Words of *Syricius* had conveyed to them before; nay, thoſe, who had rejected the Letter as ſpurious, for no other Reaſon but becauſe *Syricius* was there made to diſown a Power, which he undoubtedly had, were not aſhamed now to maintain, that he diſowned no ſuch Power. Some of them have a particular Faculty or Talent at making Authors ſay what they never thought or dreamt of; nay, at making them affirm what they flatly deny, and deny what they poſitively affirm. But they have not been ſo ſucceſsful on this as on ſeveral other Occaſions. The Words of *Syricius* are too plain and preciſe to admit of any plauſible, or even probable, Miſinterpretation. To avoid therefore the tireſome and unneceſſary Task of confuting the forced Interpretations they have put on the Words of *Syricius*, I refer the Reader to his Letter, which is the Fifth amongſt *Ambroſe*'s Letters; and leave him to judge, whether it was poſſible for him to diſclaim, in Terms leſs liable to Miſinterpretations, the Power of judging a Cauſe committed by a Council to the Judgment of others, which was diſclaiming, in other Words, that univerſal Juriſdiction, which his Succeſſors have uſurped, and pretend to exerciſe by Divine Right.

(9) Idem ibid. (1) David. p. 562, 563. (2) Bar. ad ann. 389. n. 76.
(3) Vid. Blond. primau. p. 236. (4) Holſt. coll. Rom. t. 1. p. 189.

Bonosus *exercises the Episcopal Functions after his Condemnation.*

As *Syricius* declined the judging of *Bonosus*, his Cause was in the End decided, and he condemned by *Anysius* and the other Bishops, to whom that Judgment had been committed by the Council of *Capua*. It was at the same time decreed, that those who had been ordained by him after the first Sentence, that is, after his Suspension, should retain the Degrees to which he had raised them. This Indulgence was shewn, as is declared in the Decree, contrary to the common Rule, *on account of the present Necessity*; that is, lest they should adhere to *Bonosus*, and form a Schism [p]. *Bonosus*, though thus condemned, continued to exercise the Episcopal Functions, and, holding separate Assemblies, to ordain, without Examination or Distinction, all who presented themselves to him: nay, he is even charged with dragging some by open Force to his Conventicle, and ordaining them there against their Will [q]: a kind of Rape never heard of before. What Advantage he could propose to himself or others in so doing, we are not told, and it is not easy to guess. The Bishops of *Macedon* allowed even those, who were thus ordained, to keep their respective Degrees in the Catholic Church, upon their only receiving the Benediction of a lawful Bishop. Hence those, who found themselves excluded by the Church from holy Orders, on account of their scandalous Lives, applied to *Bonosus*, pretending to espouse his Party, but left him as soon as they had obtained the Degree they wanted [r]. *Bonosus* died about the Year 410. but his Doctrine did not die with him, being maintained by some Two hundred Years after his Death (B).

He ordains some by Force.

An End put to the Schism of Antioch.

Syricius had, in the last Year of his Life, the Satisfaction of seeing an End put at length to the Schism of *Antioch*, which I have had so frequent Occasion to speak of; and the East and West, after so long a Misunderstanding, or rather Separation, happily reunited. This great

[p] Concil. t. 2. p. 1274. [q] Ib. p. 1275. [r] Ib.

(B) His Followers were known by the Name of *Bonosiacs* or *Bonosians*; and Mention is made of them by Pope *Gregory*, towards the Latter-end of the Sixth Century (1). That Pope writes, as does likewise *Gennadius* (2), that the Church rejected their Baptism, because they did not baptize in the Name of the Three Divine Persons. But the Council of *Arles*, held in 452. by the Seventeenth Canon, commands the *Bonosians* to be received into the Church by the holy Unction, the Imposition of Hands, and a Confession of Faith, *it being certain, that they baptize in the Name of the Trinity* (3). It is to be observed, that several Writers have confounded the *Bonosians* with the *Photinians*, who did not baptize in the Name of the Three Persons; and by them both *Gregory* and *Gennadius* were misled (4).

(1) Greg. l. 9. ep. 61. (2) Id. ib. Genn. dog. c. 52. (3) Avit. frag. p. 188. (4) Vide Concil. t. 2. p. 1270. & t. 3. p. 663. & t. 4. p. 1013.

Work

Work was accompliſhed in the following Manner: *Evagrius*, the Succeſſor of *Paulinus*, dying not long after his Promotion, *Flavianus* employed all the Credit and Intereſt he had at Court, and with the Clergy of *Antioch*, to prevent the Election of a new Biſhop in the room of the deceaſed: and ſo far his Endeavours proved ſucceſsful. But he could by no means gain the *Euſtathians*, who continued to aſſemble apart, or prevail either upon the Biſhops of *Egypt*, or *Syricius*, and the other Weſtern Biſhops, to admit him to their Communion, though he had no Competitor, whoſe Cauſe they could eſpouſe againſt him. Thus, through the inflexible Obſtinacy of the *Egyptian* and Weſtern Biſhops, was Diſcord kept alive, and a kind of Schiſm fomented among the Prelates and Members of the Catholic Church, ſays *Sozomen* [s]. In this Situation Affairs continued from the Year 392. in which *Evagrius* died, to the Year 398. when the famous *John Chryſoſtom*, Presbyter of the Church of *Antioch*, was, in regard of his extraordinary Merit, preferred to the See of *Conſtantinople*. No ſooner was he placed in that high Station, than his generous Diſpoſition, above all little Piques and Jealouſies, his Zeal for the Welfare of the Church in general, and the tender Regard he had for that of *Antioch* in particular, prompted him to employ all the Credit and Authority, which his new Dignity gave him, in bringing about an intire Reconciliation between the Eaſt and the Weſt, and reſtoring the Church of *Antioch* to the Communion of thoſe Churches, from which it had been ſo long ſeparated [t]. *Chryſoſtom* had been conſecrated by *Theophylus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, whom the Council of *Capua* had appointed to decide, with the other Biſhops of *Egypt*, the Difference between *Flavianus* and *Evagrius*, as I have related above. To him therefore, before he left *Conſtantinople* to return to *Egypt*, the new Biſhop of that City, impatient to ſee ſo great a Work brought to a happy Iſſue, imparted his Intention of attempting a Reconciliation between *Flavianus* and *Syricius* Biſhop of *Rome*, earneſtly intreating him to ſecond and promote with his Endeavours an Undertaking truly worthy of the two firſt Biſhops of the Eaſt.

Chryſoſtom *ſtudies to reconcile the Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops.*

There had ſubſiſted a Miſunderſtanding between *Theophylus* and *Flavianus* ever ſince the Year 391. when the Council of *Capua* was held. *Flavianus* had refuſed to ſubmit his Cauſe to the Judgment of *Theophylus*, purſuant to the Reſolution of that Council; which he had highly reſented; and, in the Height of his Reſentment, as he was

Flavianus *and* Theophylus *reconciled.*

[s] Soz. l. 8. c. 3. [t] Theod. l. 5. c. 23. Soz. l. 8. c. 3.

a Man of a fiery and choleric Temper, he had wrote to *Flavianus* in a very haughty and imperious Style. To these Letters *Nestorius* no doubt alludes, where he tells us, that *Egypt* could not, by her menacing Letters, though written in the Style, and with all the Haughtiness of an imperious Tyrant, move or terrify the blessed *Flavianus* [u]. It was necessary, in the first place, to remove the Misunderstanding which had so long subsisted between these Two Prelates; and in this *Chrysostom* met with no Difficulty or Obstruction, *Theophylus* readily acquiescing to the Terms he proposed in the Name of *Flavianus*, and *Flavianus* ratifying them, upon the first notice, without the least Exception or Limitation. What these Terms were, we are no-where told; but it is certain, that, all Disputes being thereby composed, the Bishops of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* were intirely reconciled, and the Communion between them renewed, to the great Satisfaction of both [w]. The next Thing to be attempted, and, as was apprehended, the most difficult to be accomplished, was the reconciling of *Syricius* with the Bishop of *Antioch*, who had now held that See Seventeen Years, but had not been able, notwithstanding the great Character he bore, to obtain the Communion of *Syricius*, or any of his Predecessors, on account of their strong Prejudice against him, as well as his Predecessor *Meletius*, and their obstinate Attachment to the contrary Party, in Opposition to the far greater Part of the Eastern Bishops. But the Zeal of *Chrysostom* was Proof against all Difficulties. Not despairing therefore of Success, he took the most effectual Means a consummate Prudence could dictate, to obtain it, advising the Bishops of *Antioch* and *Alexandria* to acquaint the Bishop of *Rome*, by a solemn Embassy, with their Reconciliation, and at the same time to beg, in the Name of *Flavianus*, the Communion of that See. This he knew would flatter the Vanity of *Syricius*, and be of more Weight than any Remonstrances they could make. They readily fell in with the Proposal, and Deputies were immediately chosen to put it in Execution. These were *Acacius* Bishop of *Beræa*, *Demetrius* of *Pessinus*, and several other Bishops, with *Isidorus* Presbyter and Hospitaler of the Church of *Alexandria*, and a great Number of Presbyters and Deacons of the Church of *Antioch*. *Acacius*, who was at the Head of this Deputation, was charged by *Chrysostom* to present to *Syricius* the Decree of his Election to the See of *Constantinople* [x]. That so great

Chrysostom *attempts a Reconciliation between* Flavianus *and* Syricius.

His prudent Conduct.

[u] Marc. t. 2. p. 86. [w] Socr. l. 5. c. 15. [x] Soz. l. 8. c. 3. Socr. l. 6. c. 9. Pallad. dial. c. 4.

an

an Honour might not be conferred in vain on the See of *Rome*, it was thought adviſable to acquaint *Syricius* with their Deſign, before they ſet out, and to be well aſſured of a kind Reception on their Arrival in the Weſt. They gave him accordingly early Notice of their Intention, and he, taken with the Bait, readily promiſed to ſettle every thing to their Satisfaction [y]; which he did accordingly, receiving them, on their Arrival at *Rome*, with the greateſt Marks of Reſpect and Eſteem, and admitting *Flavianus* to his Communion. From *Rome* the Deputies repaired into *Egypt*, where all the Biſhops, following the Example of *Theophylus* and *Syricius*, acknowleged *Flavianus* for lawful Biſhop of *Antioch*, and, aſſembling in Council, with great Solemnity, embraced his Communion. From *Egypt* the Deputies ſet out for *Antioch*, and there, by delivering to *Flavianus* Letters of Communion from the Weſtern and *Egyptian* Biſhops, completed the great Work, and with it their Deputation [z]. Thus was an End put, at laſt, to the Schiſm of *Antioch*; and, after ſo many Years of Strife and Contention, a perfect Harmony and good Underſtanding were ſettled anew between the Eaſt and the Weſt (A).

Syricius *and* Flavianus *reconciled.*

The Miſunderſtanding between the Eaſt and the Weſt intirely removed.

Flavianus,

[y] Theod. l. 5. c. 23. [z] Soz. l. 5. c. 15. Theod. ib. Pallad. dial. p. 10.

(A) If *Syricius* is to blame (and who, but *Baronius*, can excuſe him?) for not acknowleging *Flavianus*, at leaſt after the Death of *Paulinus*, the Election of his Succeſſor *Evagrius* being unqueſtionably uncanonical and illegal; how much more is he to blame for not acknowleging him even after the Death of *Evagrius*, when he had no Pretence whatſoever for denying him his Communion, and by granting it he might have put an End to the Schiſm? *Baronius*, to conceal the Truth, and miſlead his Readers, takes a great deal of Pains, in his Account of this Schiſm, to place in a falſe Light all the Tranſactions relating to it. But, in ſpite of all the Art he has been able to uſe, to varniſh over the Conduct of *Syricius*, and impoſe on the Public, it muſt appear undeniable to every impartial, I may ſay, to every rational, Man, that the Schiſm, and the many Evils attending it, which are pathetically deſcribed by *Chryſoſtom*, who was then at *Antioch* (1), were intirely owing to the Pride and Obſtinacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, at leaſt during the laſt Six Years, that is, from the Year 382. when *Evagrius* died, to 388. when he yielded, at laſt, upon his being courted to it by a ſolemn Embaſſy. He had nothing then to object againſt the Election, and much leſs againſt the Conduct of *Flavianus*; and, if he had nothing then, he could have nothing before; ſo that it was merely from a haughty and obſtinate Spirit that he refuſed to communicate with him, and, by ſuch a Refuſal, kept up and fomented a Diviſion ſo pernicious to the Church. *Baronius* repreſents him as labouring with indefatigable Pains to reſtore the Tranquillity of the Church, and leaving nothing unattempted that could any-ways contribute to the promoting of ſo pious an Undertaking, an Undertaking which he had ſo much at Heart. But that he had nothing at Heart beſides the Glory of his See, is but too manifeſt from his Conduct; for the Minute that was ſaved, as it was by the above-mentioned Deputation, all the Difficulties vaniſhed at once, which till then had obſtructed the Work. As for the Con-

(1) Chryſ. in Eph. hom. 11.

duct

Flavianus *endeavours in vain to gain over the* Euſtathians.

Flavianus, being thus at laſt in the Seventeenth Year of his Epiſcopacy, acknowleged by, and united in Communion with, all the Biſhops of the Catholic Church, ſpared no Pains to gain over the *Euſtathians*, that, by reuniting them to the reſt of his Flock, he might have the Merit and Glory of eſtabliſhing an intire and laſting Tranquillity in the Church committed to his Care. But his Zeal was not therein attended with the wiſhed-for Succeſs. The Glory of completing ſo great and deſirable a Work was, by Providence, reſerved for *Alexander*, one of his Succeſſors, who had the Satisfaction of ſeeing all Party-Names laid aſide, and the whole People of *Antioch* united in one Flock, under one and the ſame Shepherd. This Union was made with great Solemnity, in the Year 415. Eleven Years after the Death of *Flavianus*, and Eighty-five after the Beginning of the Schiſm. Thus *Theodoret*, in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory [a]. But *Theodorus* the Lector aſſures us, that there ſtill remained ſome

[a] Theodoret. l. 5. c. 35.

duct of *Flavianus*, in refuſing to ſubmit his Cauſe to the Judgment of the Council of *Capua*, or of the *Egyptian* Biſhops, appointed to judge it by that Council, it muſt appear, if impartially conſidered, more worthy of Commendation than Blame, tho' condemned, in very unbecoming Terms, by the Sticklers for the See of *Rome*. He had been choſen in the Oecumenical Council of *Conſtantinople*, in the Year 381. by the unanimous Voice of all the Biſhops of the Dioceſe of the Eaſt, or the Patriarchate of *Antioch*, and ſoon after ordained in their Preſence, at *Antioch*, with the Approbation of *Neſtorius*, then Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and the loud Acclamations of the far greater Part of the People of *Antioch*, promiſing themſelves, in him, a ſecond *Meletius*, in whoſe room he was choſen (2). Being thus choſen and ordained, he was acknowleged by all the Biſhops of the Eaſt, except thoſe of *Egypt*, of the Iſland of *Cyprus*, and *Arabia*. Could he therefore, without ſhamefully betraying *the undoubted Right, which the Biſhops of each Dioceſe had of chuſing their Metropolitan*, ſuffer his Election to be queſtioned and canvaſſed by the Weſtern Biſhops, who had no Concern in it; and, beſides, had openly eſpouſed the Cauſe of his Competitor *Paulinus*, and ſupported him, ſo long as he lived, with the moſt open and avowed Partiality? Could he, without foregoing, in a manner ſtill more ſhameful, both his own Right, and that of his Electors, out of Compliance to the Biſhops aſſembled at *Capua*, put himſelf upon the Level with *Evagrius*, whoſe Election and Ordination were undoubtedly illegal? Beſides, *Flavianus* was ſenſible, that the Eaſtern Biſhops would have paid no manner of Regard to the Sentence of the Council; that, had the Council adjudged the See of *Antioch* to *Evagrius*, ſuch a Judgment, inſtead of cloſing, would have widened the Breach between the Eaſt and the Weſt; and conſequently, that his complying with their Summons, far from anſwering the End they prpoſed to themſelves, would more probably have had a quite contrary Effect, ſince he had but too much room to ſuppoſe, that the ſtrong Prejudice, which they had on all Occaſions betrayed againſt him, would incline them to favour his Competitor, notwithſtanding the known Illegality both of his Election and Ordination. It was therefore, upon the Whole, very prudent in him to decline putting the Affair upon that Iſſue.

(2) Socr. l. 5. c. 5. Soz. l. 7. c. 3. Theod. l. 5. c. 9. Cod. Theod. ap. p. 104.

Seeds

Seeds of that unhappy Diviſion till the Year 482. when the Body of *Euſtathius* being brought back to *Antioch*, the few *Euſtathians*, who ſtill continued to aſſemble apart, joined the reſt of the Catholics, and the Name of *Euſtathian* was never more heard of [b]. *Flavianus* died in the Year 404. the Ninety-fifth of his Age, and Twenty-third of his Epiſcopacy, and is now honoured as a Saint; a Diſtinction which none of his Competitors have deſerved, though as much careſſed and favoured by the Two Biſhops of *Rome*, *Damaſus* and *Syricius*, as he was oppoſed and ill uſed. How fallible have the Biſhops of that See ſhewed themſelves, from the earlieſt Times, in their Judgment of things! How raſh in taking Parties, and fomenting Diſcords! How obſtinate and inflexible in maintaining the Cauſe, which they had once undertaken, let it be ever ſo bad! The only thing that can be alleged againſt the Character of *Flavianus*, is his having accepted the Biſhoprick of *Antioch*, contrary to the Oath he had taken, on Occaſion of the Agreement between *Meletius* and *Paulinus*, as I have related above [c]. That he took ſuch an Oath, is vouched both by *Socrates* and *Sozomen* [d]. But as he was looked upon by all the Eaſt, and extolled by *Chryſoſtom*, even in his Lifetime, as a Prelate of an unblemiſhed Character, and never reproached, even by his greateſt Enemies, with ſuch an Oath, in the many Diſputes that aroſe about his Election, I had rather charge thoſe Two Writers with one Miſtake more (for they are guilty of many others), than a Man of *Flavianus*'s Probity with ſuch a ſcandalous Prevarication.

Flavianus *honoured by the Church of* Rome *as a Saint, tho' ill uſed in his Life-time by the Popes.*

Syricius did not long enjoy the Satisfaction he had, to ſee the Schiſm of *Antioch* ended in his Days, and a good Underſtanding ſettled anew between the Eaſt and the Weſt. He died the ſame Year 398. and, according to the moſt probable Opinion, on the 26th of *November* [e]. He is ſaid, in his Epitaph, quoted by *Baronius* [f], to have been a Man of a tender, compaſſionate, and generous Temper; to have ſtudied the Happineſs of the People committed to his Care; to have ſpared no Pains in procuring them the Bleſſings that flow from Peace and Tranquillity, and to have ſcreened ſeveral Perſons from the Wrath of the Emperor, to maintain the Rights of the Church [g]. He is commended by *Ambroſe*, and the whole Council of

Syricius *dies.*

[b] Theodor. Lect. l. 2. [c] Vid. p. 221. [d] Socr. l. 5. c. 5. Soz. l. 7. c. 3.
[e] Vid. Bolland. 22 Feb. p. 282. [f] Bar. ad ann. 398. in app. [g] Id. ib.

Was once honoured as a Saint.

Milan, as *a vigilant Paſtor* [g], by *Iſidore* of *Seville* as *an illuſtrious Pontiff* [h]; and he has even a Place among the other Saints, in moſt of the antient Martyrologies [i]. However, *Baronius* has not thought him worthy of a Place in the *Roman* Martyrology. It is well known, that the Charge of reviſing and correcting the *Roman* Martyrology was committed, by Pope *Gregory* XIII. to *Baronius*, with full Power to reject ſuch as he ſhould judge unworthy, and admit others in their room, whom he ſhould declare worthy of the public Worſhip, and a Place there (B). *The Keys of Heaven*, ſays a modern Writer, ſpeaking of that Charge, *were taken from* Peter, *and given to* Baronius; *for it was not by* Peter, *but by* Baronius, *that ſome were excluded from, and others admitted into, Heaven* [k].

Why expunged by Baronius *out of the Calendar of Saints.*

He then ſhews, that, by this *Second Minos*, as he ſtyles him, ſeveral were driven from the Seats they had long held in Heaven, and to which they had a juſt Claim, to make room for others, who had no Claim. Among the former he names *Syricius*, whom he thinks *Baronius* ought to have treated in a more friendly manner, upon the Recommendation of *Ambroſe*, of the Council of *Milan*, and of *Iſidore*. What thus prejudiced *Baronius* againſt him, and outweighed, in his Scales, all the Recommendations that could be produced in his Favour, was his Indifference for *Jerom* and *Paulinus*, and the Kindneſs he ſhewed to

[g] Amb. ep. 7. [h] Iſid. vir. ill. c. 3. [i] Florent. p. 999. Bolland. Feb. 22. p. 282. [k] Aguilera ſanti di Palermo.

(B) The Roman Martyrology contains the Names of ſuch Saints as may be publicly worſhiped, and of the Places where they died, with a ſuccinct Account of the moſt remarkable Feats which they are ſuppoſed to have performed. I ſaid, *who are publicly worſhiped*; for in private every one is allowed to honour, worſhip, and invoke whom they pleaſe, provided they have ſufficient Grounds to believe them in *a State of Happineſs*, or *in the Way to it*, that is, in Heaven, or in Purgatory; for the Souls in Purgatory may be privately worſhiped, and invoked; nay, moſt of the Popiſh Divines are now of Opinion, that even a canonized Saint may be ſtill in Purgatory. When Learning began to revive, many groſs Miſtakes were diſcovered in the *Roman*, as well as in the other Martyrologies, ſome being placed among the Saints, and conſequently worſhiped as Saints, who had been notorious Sinners; and others daily invoked, who had never exiſted. That the Church therefore might be no longer miſled in her Worſhip, *Gregory* XIII. thought it neceſſary to interpoſe his *infallible Authority*; and, having, accordingly, ordered *Baronius* to reviſe and correct the *Roman* Martyrology, he confirmed, by a ſpecial Bull, dated the 14th of *January* 1584. all the Emendations, Additions, Corrections, &c. which *Baronius* had been pleaſed to make, threatening with *the Indignation of the Almighty God, and of his Apoſtles St.* Peter *and St.* Paul, all who ſhould preſume to make any further Alterations. And yet many Alterations have been made ſince *Gregory*'s Time; and that many more might and ought to be made, has been ſufficiently ſhewn by many Proteſtant, and ſome Roman Catholic, Divines.

Ruffinus,

Ruffinus, *Jerom*'s Antagoniſt. *Syricius*, inſtead of protecting *Jerom*, as his Predeceſſor *Damaſus* had done, againſt the *Roman* Clergy, whom he had provoked with his Writings, gave him, in a manner, up to their Reſentment; which obliged him to abandon *Rome*, and return into the Eaſt, as I have related above. The Name of *Paulinus*, afterwards Biſhop of *Nola*, is famous in the Hiſtory of the Church, and celebrated by *Jerom*, *Ambroſe*, *Auſtin*, and all the Writers of thoſe Times. He had abandoned the World, and the immenſe Wealth he poſſeſſed, to lead a retired Life; and, in the Year 395. he paſſed through *Rome*, in his Way to *Nola*, which he had choſen for the Place of his Retirement. The Treatment he met with at *Rome*, from that Clergy, and *Syricius* himſelf, muſt have been very unworthy of a Man of his Character, ſince it obliged him, as he himſelf writes [l], to quit the City in great Haſte, and purſue his Journey to *Nola*. Two Years afterwards *Ruffinus* came to *Rome*, and there met with a very different Reception. For *Syricius* received him, tho' violently ſuſpected of *Origeniſm*, with the greateſt Marks of Eſteem and Affection; and, after having entertained him a whole Year, gave him Letters of Communion at his Departure. Of this *Jerom* complains, as if Advantage had been taken of the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Simplicity, to impoſe upon him [m]. I will not pretend, as ſome have done, to juſtify *Ruffinus*; but cannot help obſerving, that ſuch a Charge ought not to be admitted againſt him, upon the bare Authority of *Jerom*, or of thoſe, who have only copied what he wrote.

Jerom and *Ruffinus* had lived ſeveral Years in cloſe Friendſhip, and great Intimacy; but, falling out in the Year 393. their former Friendſhip was turned at once into an open and avowed Enmity. What gave Occaſion to this Breach I ſhall relate hereafter, and only obſerve here, that *Jerom* not only quarreled with *Ruffinus*, but with all the Friends of *Ruffinus*; nay, and with thoſe too, who, profeſſing an equal Friendſhip for both, would not break with either, or anyways interfere in the Quarrel. Among theſe was the celebrated *Roman* Matron *Melania*, ſo frequently ſpoken of, and ſo highly commended, by *Auſtin*, by *Paulinus*, and, above all, by *Jerom* himſelf, who has filled his Letters with her Praiſes, propoſing her as a true Pattern of every Virtue becoming her Sex.

Jerom *and* Ruffinus *quarrel.*

Melania had retired with *Ruffinus* to *Jeruſalem*, Twenty-ſeven Years before, and continued there practiſing, under his Direction,

[l] Paul. ep. 1. [m] Hier. ep. 16. & in Ruf. l. 3. c. 6, & 7.

Jerom *quarrels with all the Friends of* Ruffinus, *especially with* Melania.

thoſe Works of Charity, which *Jerom* ſo often admires and extols. It could not therefore be expected, that ſhe ſhould diſcard *the Partner of her holy Life, and all her good Works*, as *Paulinus* ſtyles him [n], the Minute the other was pleaſed to diſlike him, or, indeed, that ſhe ſhould take any Part at all in the Quarrel. And yet, becauſe ſhe prudently declined taking Part, but continued to ſhew the ſame Affection and Eſteem for *Ruffinus*, which ſhe had done before; *Jerom*, forgetful of the Regard that was due to a Matron of her Birth and Piety, and of the high Encomiums which he had himſelf beſtowed on her, began to inveigh with no leſs Bitterneſs againſt her, than againſt *Ruffinus* himſelf. In one of his Letters, ſtill extant [o], after finding Fault with one of *Ruffinus*'s Friends, thought to be *John* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, he adds; "But, after all, he is not ſo much "to blame as his Inſtructors *Ruffinus* and *Melania*, who, with a great "deal of Trouble and Pains, have taught him to know nothing." *Ruffinus* tells us, that *Jerom*, finding that *Melania*, who was a Matron of great Judgment and Penetration, did not approve of his Actions and Conduct, thereupon ſpitefully eraſed out of his Chronicle, what he had there wrote in her Praiſe [p]. But he did not, nor was it, perhaps, in his Power to make ſuch an Alteration in all the Copies; for what he is ſaid to have cancelled, is ſtill remaining in all the printed, as well as manuſcript Copies of that Work, which have reached our Times. *Melania* lived Eighteen Years after, ſteadily purſuing the ſame Courſe of Life, for which *Jerom* had once propoſed her as a Pattern to her whole Sex [q]. She died at *Jeruſalem* in the Year 411. and died poor, having ſpent an immenſe Eſtate in relieving the Needy and Indigent, not only of the Countries where ſhe lived, and through which ſhe paſſed, but thoſe too of the moſt diſtant Provinces of the Empire. For Perſons in Poverty and Diſtreſs, whether in *Perſia* or *Britain*, ſays the Author of her Life [r], were alike the Objects of her Charity, and felt alike the Effects of her Generoſity and Good-nature. She died, but with her did not die the Rancour and Spleen which *Jerom* had for ſo many Years harboured in his Breaſt againſt her. For, carrying his Reſentment even beyond the Grave, while the Poor were every-where bemoaning, with Tears, the Loſs of ſo generous a Benefactreſs, while the Writers were paying the deſerved Tribute of Praiſe to the Virtues of ſo pious

His Conduct towards her.

[n] Paul. ep. 9. [o] Hier. ep. 101. [p] Ex Ruf. l. 2. [q] Vid. Hier. ep. 99.
[r] Pallad. hiſt. Lauſiac. in Bibl. Patr. c. 118.

a Matron,

a Matron, *Jerom*, inſtead of joining the reſt in the common Grief, ſtrove to dry up their Tears, to drown their Praiſes, by throwing out ſeveral peeviſh and ill-natured Reflections on the Memory of the Deceaſed. As the famous *Pelagius* had inſcribed a Book to her before he broached his Opinions, *Jerom*, in the Letter, which he wrote to *Cteſiphon* againſt the *Pelagians*, could not forbear bringing her in, and obſerving on that Occaſion, with a malignant Quibble, that the very Name of *Melania* beſpoke (in the *Greek* Tongue), and ſufficiently declared, the *Blackneſs* of her Treachery and Perfidiouſneſs [s].

Such was the Conduct of *Jerom* towards that illuſtrious Matron, in her Life-time, and after her Death. From this Conduct I leave the Reader to judge, whether the Authority of ſo prejudiced a Writer ought to have been of ſuch Weight with *Baronius* as to make him exclude her, as well as *Syricius*, from the *Roman* Martyrology, or the Calendar of Saints. Should we grant *Ruffinus* to have really held the Errors, which *Jerom* charged him with, it muſt ſtill be owned, that *Melania* acted, as became a Perſon of her Wiſdom, Piety, and Experience, in ſuſpending her Judgment, and not breaking with *Ruffinus*, till ſhe was otherwiſe convinced, than by the Invectives of his Antagoniſt, equally levelled againſt herſelf, that he was no longer worthy of her Friendſhip and Regard. As for *Syricius*, *Jerom* rather commends than blames him, even where he complains of his Kindneſs to *Ruffinus*. For he only ſays, that *Ruffinus* abuſed the Simplicity of *Syricius*, who judged of the Spirit of others from his own [t]; which was ſaying, in other Words, that he was a good Man, but miſtaken in his Judgment, or not infallible: ſo that his only Crime, according to *Jerom*, was want of Infallibility. However, upon the Authority of that Father, *Baronius* not only condemns the Conduct of *Syricius*, but, raſhly prying into the inſcrutable Secrets of Providence, pretends his Days to have been ſhortened for the Countenance he gave to *Ruffinus*, and the Remiſſneſs he ſhewed in ſuppreſſing the Errors, with which he was charged. It is certain, that *Ruffinus* was well received, and entertained, in a very hoſpitable manner, by *Syricius*, during his Stay at *Rome*; and that, upon his leaving that City, he received from him Letters of Communion. Now, if *Syricius* did not know, or did not believe, that *Ruffinus* held thoſe Errors, how unjuſt is it to blame him for the Kindneſs he

Syricius *not to be condemned on the bare Authority of* Jerom.

[s] Hier. ad Cteſ. l. 2. [t] Hier. in Ruf. l. 3. c. 6, 7.

ſhewed to a Man of *Ruffinus*'s Character! If he did know, and yet gave him Letters of Communion, how will *Baronius* be able to clear *Syricius* from the Imputation of holding the ſame Errors (A)?

The Miſunderſtanding between Syricius *and* Paulinus *no Charge againſt* Syricius.

As for the Treatment *Paulinus* of *Nola* met with from *Syricius*, there was, no doubt, a Miſunderſtanding between them; but, as I am quite in the Dark as to the Cauſe of it, I will not take upon me to condemn the one rather than the other. Perhaps they were both to blame; perhaps they both meant well, and neither was to blame. However that be, the Miſunderſtanding between them was ſoon removed; for, during the remaining Part of *Syricius*'s Life, *Paulinus* went conſtantly to *Rome* once a Year, as he himſelf declares, in one of his Letters [u]. *Syricius*, it is true, did not take *Jerom* into his Protection, as his Predeceſſor had done, nor ſhew him the ſame Kindneſs; which is the Third Charge brought by *Baronius* againſt him, but of no more Weight than the other Two, that is, of none at all. *Jerom*, prompted by his Zeal, and cenſorious Temper, could not help inveighing, with great Bitterneſs, in all his Writings, againſt the Looſeneſs and Debauchery, which univerſally prevailed, in his Time, among the *Roman* Clergy, and the pious Frauds they made uſe of to extort Legacies and Preſents from old Men, from Widows, and from Orphans. *Syricius* might have been as much offended at the Vices of his libertine Clergy, as *Jerom* was, and even ſtudied to reform them; but, at the ſame time, be glad, without deſerving the leaſt Reproach on that ſcore, to get rid of ſo troubleſome a Cenſor, who thus expoſed their Irregularities to the Eyes, and them to the Contempt, of the World (B).

Syricius

[u] Paulin. ep. 16.

(A) A modern Writer (1), taking the Part of *Syricius* againſt *Baronius*, has compoſed a whole Diſſertation, and not a ſhort one, to ſhew *how undeſervedly* Syricius *has been caſhiered in this Review of the Church triumphant, while many others paſſed Muſter for great Saints, whoſe Virtues*, he might have ſaid, whoſe very Exiſtence, *may be juſtly diſputed.* I ſhall not enter into the tedious Detail of his Arguments and Reaſons, but only obſerve, that the Name of *Syricius* ought not to have been ſtruck out of the Calendar, while the Names of the *Arian* Pope *Liberius*, and the Antipope *Felix*, his Antagoniſt, were kept in; though, upon other Accounts, I think him myſelf very unworthy of the Name of a Saint.

(B) The Feſtival of *Syricius* was never kept, it ſeems, by public Authority; but is marked in ſome antient Martyrologies, on the 22d of *February*, and in others on the 26th of *November*. The laſt was more probably the Day of his Death, ſince he is ſaid, both by *Proſper* and *Iſidore*, to have governed 14 Years, to complete which one Month only will be wanting, if we place

(1) Florentinus, in vetus Martyrol. Hieronymi, p. 1001—1010.

his

Syricius was interred in the Cœmetery of *Priſcilla*, but his Body was tranſlated, about the Latter-end of the Eighth Century, to the Church of St. *Praxedes* [z], where his Remains (for *Baronius* will not allow us to call them Reliques) ſtill lie unregarded.

ARCADIUS, **ANASTASIUS,** HONORIUS.

Thirty-eighth BISHOP *of* Rome.

SYRICIUS was ſucceded by *Anaſtaſius* [a], after a Vacancy of Twenty Days, according to ſome; and, according to others, of near Two Months. He was no ſooner choſen, than he wrote a kind and obliging Letter to *Paulinus*, then at *Nola* in *Campania*, and another in his Commendation to the Biſhops of that Province [b]. This he is ſuppoſed to have done, in order to efface the bad Impreſſion, which the Treatment *Paulinus* had met with in the Time of *Syricius*, might have given him againſt that See, and the *Roman* Clergy. Year of Chriſt 398. Anaſtaſius *writes to* Paulinus.

It was in the Time of *Anaſtaſius*, and ſoon after his Election, that the famous Diſpute aroſe between *Jerom* and *Ruffinus*, which was afterwards carried on with a Warmth on both Sides quite unbecoming Men of their Profeſſion. Of this Quarrel, and the Part *Anaſtaſius* acted on that Occaſion, the Writers of thoſe Times give us the following Account. *Ruffinus*, a Presbyter of *Aquileia*, and a great Admirer of *Origen*, having accompanied *Melania*, whom he had attended Twenty-five Years at *Jeruſalem*, on her Return to *Rome* in the Time of *Syricius*, was received there with extraordinary Marks of Eſteem by the *Roman* Clergy, and *Syricius* himſelf, as I have obſerved elſewhere [c]. Encouraged by the Reception he met with, he continued a whole Year at *Rome*; and during that Time publiſhed, but *What occaſioned the Quarrel between* Jerom *and* Ruffinus.

[z] Vid. Boll. prop. p. 59. [a] Theod. l. 5. c. 24. Soz. l. 7. c. 34. Aug. de civ. Dei.
[b] Paul. ep. 16. [c] Page 273.

his Death on that Day; and ſeveral, if with *Baronius* we ſuppoſe him to have died on the 22d of *February* (2); for, as to the Year of his Death, there is no Diſagreement among Authors. *Baronius* mentions an antient Picture, Part whereof, ſays he, is ſtill to be ſeen in the Title of Pope *Syricius* (3). But that Picture is no more to be ſeen, and he explains himſelf no farther.

(2) Vid. Boll. 22 Feb. p. 282.

(3) Bar. ad ann. 395. n. 6.

without

Ruffinus *translates* Origen's Periarchion.

without putting his Name to it, a *Latin* Translation of *Origen's Periarchon*, or *Treatise of Principles*, having first removed the Prejudice which some might entertain against that Writer, by the Translation of an Apology, which the Martyr *Pamphylus* had composed in his Vindication, while he was in Prison. To this Apology he added a Piece of his own, shewing that most of the Errors ascribed to *Origen* had been maliciously inserted into his Works by his Enemies after his Death [d]. In the Preface to the *Periarchon* itself he also declared, that, in Imitation of a learned Brother, meaning *Jerom*, who had translated above Seventy of *Origen's* Books, he had either corrected or suppressed such Errors as had appeared to him repugnant to the Articles of the Catholic Faith [e]. The Work, thus recommended, was received with uncommon Applause at *Rome*, and the Sentiments of *Origen* greedily embraced, and warmly maintained by great Numbers of the Clergy as well as the Laity, to whom *Origen* had till then been, it seems, utterly unknown. This happened in the Time of *Syricius*, who, either not suspecting *Ruffinus*, as he had not put his Name to the Translation, or perhaps not judging him worthy of Censure for barely relating the Sentiments of another, or supposing that, agreeably to his Preface, he had suppressed whatever was wrong in the original Work, gave him Letters of Communion at his Departure from *Rome*. For he had no sooner published his Translation than he left that City, and returned to *Aquileia*. *Syricius* died soon after, and *Anastasius* was no sooner chosen in his room, than the famous *Roman* Matron *Marcella*, offended at the new Doctrines that began to prevail in *Rome*, applied to him, pressing him to put a Stop to the growing Evil, and at the same time accusing *Ruffinus* as the Author of the Translation, to which alone it was owing [f]. To make good this Charge, she produced some Copies corrected with *Ruffinus's* own Hand; and several Persons appeared, who, having by her Means been reclaimed from the Errors of *Origen*, owned they had been led into them by the Disciples of *Ruffinus* [g]. This *Jerom* cannot relate without launching into the Praises of his Heroine *Marcella*, crying up her Zeal, extolling her Courage and Resolution, in thus making head against so numerous a Band, meaning the *Origenists* in *Rome*, while the Clergy declined that Trouble, or rather promoted the Doctrines they ought to have opposed. But elsewhere he will not allow Women,

Many at Rome *embrace the Errors of* Origen.

Errors left in the Work, notwithstanding the Corrections made by the Translator.

[d] Hier. Apol. l. 2. ep. 75. & dial. adverf. Pelag. [e] Id. ap. 1. adverf. Ruff.
[f] Id. ib. [g] Id. ib.

under any Pretence whatſoever, to concern themſelves in religious Controverſies. *To meddle in Diſputes concerning Faith or Religion, is not at all the Province* (ſays he, with the Words of St. *Paul*) *of ſilly Women, laden with Sins, led away with divers Luſts, ever learning, and never able to come to the Knowlege of the Truth* [h]. But he ſpeaks here of *Melania*, who was no leſs attached to *Ruffinus* than *Marcella* was to him.

In the *Periarchon* were contained, without all doubt, many unſound and unwarrantable Notions, and *Ruffinus* corrected thoſe only that related to the Trinity. *He corrected*, ſays *Jerom*, *what* Origen *had impiouſly written concerning the Trinity, being well appriſed it would have given great Offence at* Rome. *But as to his other Errors, thoſe eſpecially concerning the Fall of the Angels, and the firſt Man, the Reſurrection, the World or Worlds of* Epicurus, *the Reſtoration of all Things*, &c. *he either left them, as he found them in the Original, or confirmed them with Reaſons borrowed from the Comment of* Didymus, *an avowed Defender of* Origen. *Thus he declared himſelf a Catholic with reſpect to the Trinity, that in other Points the Reader might not be aware of him as an Heretic* [i]. Jerom's *Charge againſt* Ruffinus.

In Anſwer to this Charge, *Ruffinus* declared, that it was never his Intention to correct all the Errors that were aſcribed to *Origen*; that the Declaration he had made, in his Preface to the *Periarchon*, ought to be reſtrained to thoſe Errors only that related to the Trinity; and that it was very uncharitable to judge of his Faith, from the Faith of the Author he tranſlated, and not from his own Words. He then declares his Sentiments touching ſome particular Points, in which *Origen* was thought to differ from the Church; adding, that where *Origen* differed from the Catholic Church, he differed from *Origen*. Ruffinus's *Anſwer*.

Anaſtaſius, notwithſtanding the Solicitations of *Marcella*, declined either proceeding againſt *Ruffinus*, or cenſuring his Tranſlation, till Two Years after, when *Jerom*, in a new Verſion which he publiſhed of the ſame Work, undertook to prove, that ſeveral Opinions of *Origen* were truly heretical, and as ſuch ought to be condemned by the Church. As to *Ruffinus*, he inveighed bitterly againſt him, as if he had tranſlated that Work with no other View but to propagate the Errors it contained. Thus began the famous Quarrel between Jerom *condemns* Origen, *and inveighs againſt* Ruffinus.

[h] Id. & Cteſiphont. adverſ. Pelag. Tim. 2. c. 3. p. 6, 7. [i] Id. apol. 1. adverſ. Ruff.

theſe

these Two Writers, which occasioned no small Disturbance in the Church, some siding with *Jerom* against *Ruffinus*, and others with *Ruffinus* against *Jerom*. Among the former, the most sanguine were *Theophylus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, *Epiphanius* Bishop of *Constantia* in the Island of *Cyprus*, and *Anastasius* Bishop of *Rome*. *Theophylus* not only condemned in a Council, which he summoned for that Purpose, the Errors of *Origen*, but *Origen* himself, declaring him an Heretic, and forbidding all under his Jurisdiction to read, or even keep his Works by them; which is the first Instance we have of such Prohibitions. His Example was followed by *Epiphanius*, *Anastasius*, *Venerius* Bishop of *Milan*, *Chromatius* Bishop of *Aquileia*, and several others. But some, and among the rest *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and *Chrysostom* then Bishop of *Constantinople*, disapproving the rash Conduct of their Collegues, could by no means be induced to confirm the Sentence they had pronounced; which *Epiphanius* resented to such a Degree, that he immediately separated himself from their Communion. *Sozomen* adds, that he even refused to pray for young *Theodosius*, while he was dangerously ill, because his Mother *Eudoxia* would not banish from *Constantinople* some Monks who had warmly espoused the Cause of *Origen* [k]. *Ruffinus* ranks *Epiphanius* among those Plagiaries, who, borrowing from *Origen* all they said or wrote, cried down his Works, in order to deter others from reading them, and consequently from discovering that what was admired in them was not their own [l].

Origen condemned by Anastasius *and several other Bishops.*

Origen being thus condemned as an Heretic, near 150 Years after his Death, *Anastasius*, at the Instigation of *Marcella*, *Pammachius*, *Oceanus*, and some other of *Jerom*'s Friends in *Rome*, wrote to *Ruffinus*, complaining of his Translation, and summoning him to appear, and give an Account of his Faith. In Answer to this Letter, *Ruffinus* sent him a Confession of Faith intirely agreeable to that of the Catholic Church, adding, that he held no other; that his Faith had been sufficiently tried in the Persecution of *Valens*; and that, as to the Translation of *Origen*'s Work, he had there neither approved nor disapproved, but barely related, the Sentiments of that Writer. He modestly declined complying with the Summons calling him to *Rome*;

Ruffinus *is summoned to* Rome.

[k] Soz. l. 8. c. 15. [l] Hier. in Ruff. l. 2. c. 6. l. 3. c. 7. & Ruff. ad Orig.

and

and concluded with declaring, that the Faith of the *Roman* Church and his were one and the ſame [1](A). But

[1] Hier. in Ruff. c. 6, 7. ep. 16, 78.

(A) The chief Errors of *Origen* were concerning the Trinity, the Reſurrection of the Body, the Eternity of Hell-Torments, and the Origin of Souls. If his Works were not interpolated by the Heretics, as *Ruffinus* pretended they were, it is no eaſy Matter to determine what was his real Opinion with reſpect to the Trinity; for in ſome Paſſages he ſeems to acknowlege an Equality, and in others to eſtabliſh an Inequality, between the Father and the Son. As to the Reſurrection, he was accuſed of not believing that the Body, at leaſt the ſame Body, was to riſe from the Dead. He denied the Eternity of Hell-Torments, and held that even the Devils would repent in the End, and be ſaved. He maintained the Souls to have been created before the World; to have been confined to the Bodies, which they animated, as ſo many Priſons, to expiate there the Sins which they had committed; to be in perpetual Motion paſſing from one Body to another, and at laſt to become Angels. With the Three laſt Errors chiefly *Ruffinus* was charged by St. *Jerom*; and it was to clear himſelf from ſuch an Imputation, that, in his Anſwer to *Anaſtaſius* ſummoning him to *Rome*, he declared his Belief with reſpect to thoſe Articles, ſtyling his Anſwer on that Account an *Apology*. As to the Trinity, thoſe whom they called *Origeniſts*, were allowed, even by their Enemies, to be quite orthodox in their Belief of that Myſtery. Touching the Reſurrection, *Ruffinus* declared and explained his Faith in ſuch clear Terms as ought to have left no room even for St. *Jerom* to arraign him on that Head. He expreſſed himſelf in a manner no leſs orthodox with reſpect to the Eternity of the Pains of Hell. But as to the Origin of Souls, he owns himſelf to be quite at a Loſs what to think, and what to determine on that Subject, ſince no particular Opinion had been yet ſettled by the Church, and the Eccleſiaſtical Writers diſagreed in that Point among themſelves; ſome believing, with *Tertullian* and *Lactantius*, the Souls to have been formed with the Bodies; and others maintaining, with *Origen*, that they were all created before the World: as to himſelf, he declared that he held nothing for certain but what he was taught by the Church, *viz.* that the Souls as well as the Bodies proceeded from God (1). This *Jerom* called a falſe, artful, and impoſing Confeſſion, as if *Ruffinus* did not believe what he profeſſed in the moſt ſolemn Manner to believe; and *Anaſtaſius*, judging of his Faith not from his own Words, but from thoſe of *Jerom*, ſeparated himſelf from his Communion.

I cannot help obſerving here, that *Jerom*, whom nothing now will ſatisfy but the Condemnation of *Origen*, uſed a few Years before to inveigh with the ſame Gall and Bitterneſs againſt the Enemies of that Writer as he does now againſt his Friends, condemning with as much Acrimony thoſe who accuſed him as he now condemns thoſe who excuſe him. *Origen* had been condemned in his Life-time by *Demetrius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and by ſeveral other Biſhops: and *Jerom*, after telling us, in ſpeaking of the Judgment that was given againſt him, that he had wrote more Books than others had time to read; and that in the Number of his Volumes he had ſurpaſſed *Varro*, and the other moſt eloquent Writers both *Greek* and *Latin*; adds, *But what Reward did he receive for ſo much Toil and Labour? He was condemned by the Biſhop* Demetrius; *and, if we except the Biſhops of* Palæſtine, Arabia, Phœnicia, *and* Achaia, *he was condemned by all the reſt. Even* Rome *aſſembled her Senate againſt him, not becauſe he taught any new Doctrines, or held any heretical Opinions, which thoſe who ſnarl at him, like ſo many mad Dogs, would fain make us believe; but becauſe they could not bear the bright Rays of his Eloquence and Knowlege, and were forced to be dumb when he ſpoke.* This Paſſage is quoted by *Ruffinus*, and *Jerom* himſelf owns it to have been copied from his Letter to *Paula* (2).

By the Senate that *Rome* aſſembled againſt *Origen*, *Jerom* meant, no doubt, the Biſhop and Clergy of that City; and that he made no Account of ther Judgment,

(1) Ruff. ad Anaſt. p. 202. (2) Hier. vir. illuſtr. c. 54. Ruff. l. 2. p. 225.

Anastasius *separates himself from his Communion.*

But this Confession, however orthodox, did not satisfy *Anastasius*, or rather *Jerom* and his Friends in *Rome*. They continued, says *Ruffinus*, the Persecution which they had so successfully begun, and with their malicious Suggestions prevailed in the End on *Anastasius* to comply with their unjust Demands [m]; that is, I suppose, to separate himself from his Communion: for *Anastasius*, in his Answer to a Letter which *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem* had wrote in favour of *Ruffinus*, acquaints that Prelate, that he had cut him off from his Communion, and left him to be judged by God and his own Conscience. *As to* Origen, says he in the same Letter, *I knew not before who he was, nor what he had wrote.* Ruffinus *has translated him into our Language; and, in so doing, what else could he have in view but to infect this Church with his pernicious Doctrines? He has expressed his own Sentiments in translating those of his Author, and is therefore no less guilty than* Origen *himself, whom we have all condemned* [n] (A).

[m] Idem ibid.

[n] Concil. t. 2. p. 1194.

sufficiently appears from the contemptuous and ironical Manner he speaks of it. However, that Father is brought in by *Baronius* as an Evidence for *Infallibility*, on account of the Regard which he afterwards paid to the Judgment of *Anastasius*, styling it *a decisive Sentence*. But *Jerom* had then changed his Opinion; and *Anastasius* only condemned what he had condemned before; so that from the great Regard which *Jerom* shewed on that Occasion for the Judgment of *Anastasius*, *Baronius* can at most conclude, that he thought the Popes infalliable when they agreed with him; for that he thought them fallible when they disagreed with him, is manifest from his not acquiescing to the Judgment of another Pope condemning *Origen*, when he himself had not yet condemned him.

(A) The same Charge lies against *Jerom*; nay, he was the more guilty of the Two. For he had not only translated many of *Origen*'s Works, containing Errors no less repugnant to the Catholic Truths than any in the *Periarchon*, but had besides filled his Comments on the Scripture, especially on the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, with the worst of *Origen*'s Errors, *viz.* with those relating to the Resurrection of the Body, to the Pre-existence of the Souls, and to the Duration of Hell-Torments, as is manifest from the many Passages quoted by *Ruffinus* out of the Comments of that Father. *Jerom* found great Fault with *Ruffinus*, for not confuting the Errors which he translated; concluding from thence that he held the same Doctrines: and yet he was himself so far from confuting in his Comments any of *Origen*'s erroneous Opinions, that on the contrary he often delivered them in such manner as made many, and St. *Austin* among the rest, believe them to be his own (1). Nay, in one Place he seems to own, that he held some of *Origen*'s Errors (2): but ends what he there writes of him thus; *If you believe me, I never was an* Origenist; *but if you absolutely insist upon my having been one, I now tell you, that I am so no more; and it is to convince you of this, that I am become the Accuser of* Origen.

(1) Hier. ep. 89.

(2) Hier. ep. 65.

In

In the ſame Letter *Anaſtaſius* mentions with great Joy a Decree of the Emperors, that is, of *Arcadius* and *Honorius*, forbidding the Works of *Origen*, and impoſing ſevere Penalties on ſuch as ſhould for the future read or peruſe them (B).

Such is the Account the cotemporary Writers, and *Jerom* himſelf, give us of the Condemnation of *Origen*, and his Interpreter *Ruffinus*, very different from that which we read in *Baronius*, introducing his *High Pontiff Anaſtaſius* as acting the Firſt Part on that Occaſion; though *Jerom* tells us, in expreſs Terms, that *Anaſtaſius* followed the Example of *Theophylus*; that he condemned in the Weſt, what had before been condemned in the Eaſt [n]; and that *Rome* and all *Italy* owed their Deliverance to the Letters of *Theophylus* [o]; meaning the circular Letter, which *Theophylus* wrote to all the Catholic Biſhops, acquainting them that he had condemned *Origen*, and prohibited his Books, and exhorting them to follow his Example [p]. It was by this Letter that *Anaſtaſius* was induced to condemn *Origen*: For what elſe could *Jerom* mean by ſaying, that *Rome* and *Italy* were, by the Letters of *Theophylus*, delivered from the Errors of *Origen*? *Baronius* could not but know, that the Letter of *Theophylus* was addreſſed to all the Catholic Biſhops, ſince it is ſtyled by *Theophylus* himſelf, in a Letter he wrote to *Epiphanius* [q], and by *Epiphanius*, in one of his Letters to *Jerom* [r], *A general Letter to all Catholics*; and yet the Annaliſt ſpeaks of it as directed to *Anaſtaſius* alone, in order to impoſe by that means on his Readers, and perſuade them, *that the Biſhop of* Alexandria *ſubmitted the Sentence he had pro-*

The Condemnation of Origen *owing chiefly to the Biſhop of* Alexandria.

[n] Hier. ep. 78. [o] Id. ep. 71. [p] Id. ep. 6, 69, 70. [q] Id. ep. 6. [r] Id. ep. 73.

(B) *Ruffinus* pretended this Letter to be ſuppoſititious, and to have been forged by St. *Jerom*, alleging, that he could not believe the Biſhop of *Rome* capable of ſuch a crying Piece of Injuſtice as to condemn an innocent Man, and condemn him in his Abſence. He added, that if *Anaſtaſius* had ever wrote ſuch a Letter to *John* of *Jeruſalem*, *John*, with whom he lived in great Intimacy, would have acquainted him with it, which he had not done. In Anſwer to this Charge, *Jerom* refers him to the Archives of the *Roman* Church (1); and to *Jerom* I refer the Jeſuit *Halloix*, ſuppoſing the Letter to have been feigned, tho' not by St. *Jerom*, on account of the following Words, that ſeem to wound the pretended Supremacy. *I have intirely ſeparated myſelf from him*, meaning *Ruffinus*; *I will not even know where he is, or what he is doing: let him try, if he pleaſes, to be abſolved elſewhere.* So that *Anaſtaſius* thought he might be abſolved elſewhere, though condemned at *Rome*. This *Halloix*, more jealous of the Papal Supremacy than the Pope himſelf, will not allow, and therefore pretends the Letter to be ſuppoſititious. But, ſince the Time of *Ruffinus*, none beſides him ever queſtioned its Authenticity.

(1) Hier. in Ruff. l. 3. c. 5, & 6.

nounced to the Judgment of Anastasius, *being well apprised, that it could be of no Weight unless confirmed by the first See.* Had he been well apprised of this, I cannot think he would have pronounced such a Sentence, as it is very certain he did, without the Authority, the Advice, or even the Knowlege, of the *first See.*

The Bishop of Aquileia *communicates with* Ruffinus, *though excommunicated by* Anastasius.

As to *Ruffinus*, *Anastasius*, it is true, separated himself from his Communion; but did not excommunicate him, that is, as the Word is now understood, did not cut him off from the Communion of the Catholic Church, as *Baronius* insinuates. The Power of excommunicating him in this Sense was by the Canons vested in his own Bishop; and it is manifest from *Jerom*, that *Chromatius*, then Bishop of *Aquileia*, continued to communicate with him after *Anastasius* had renounced his Communion; nay, after *Chromatius* himself had condemned *Origen*, and the *Origenists* [s], that is, those who held the Errors of *Origen*. A plain Proof that the Bishop of *Aquileia* did not acquiesce to the Judgment of *Anastasius* in ranking *Ruffinus* among them. And truly the only Charge brought against him by *Anastasius*, in his Letter to *John* of *Jerusalem*, was his having translated *Origen* into the *Latin* Tongue, without pointing out his Errors, or offering any Arguments to confute them. Thence he was by *Jerom* induced to conclude, that *Ruffinus* held the same Errors. *What could* Ruffinus *propose*, says he in his Letter, *by translating* Origen *into the* Roman *Language? Had he exposed the execrable Errors his Work contains, and raised in his Readers that Indignation which the Author deserves, I should rather have praised than blamed him. But he has in his Mind consented to those Errors, and in translating the Sentiments of* Origen *expressed his own* [t]. This *Ruffinus* denied, declaring, with the Words of *Origen*, in his Preface to the *Periarchon* [u], that he embraced nothing as Truth, that any-ways differed from the received Doctrines of the Catholic Church: nay, he was so far from defending any of *Origen*'s Errors, which seemed to him repugnant to the Catholic Truths, that in the Apology he composed in Defence of that Writer, as well as in the Preface which he prefixed to his Translation, he undertook to prove that those Errors were not his, but had been maliciously inserted into his Works, either by his Enemies to eclipse his Reputation, or by Heretics, who had fathered upon him their own Doctrines, with a View of recommending them to the

Ruffinus *unjustly condemned.*

[s] Apol. l. 3. c. 1. [t] Concil. t. 2. p. 1194. [u] Præf. ad Periarch. p. 665.

World

World by the Authority of ſo great and ſo venerable a Name [w]. He followed therein the Example of the moſt eminent Writers, and the greateſt Lights of the Church, namely, of the Martyr *Pamphylus* [x], of *Athanaſius* [y], *Baſil* [z], his Brother *Gregory* of *Nyſſa* [a], *Gregory Nazianzen* [b], and many others, who, out of the great Regard they had for a Man of *Origen*'s Piety and Learning, either aſcribed to others the Errors they found in his Works, or excuſed them, by putting on his Words the moſt charitable Conſtruction they could bear. *Jerom* himſelf had been formerly one of *Origen*'s greateſt Admirers, had tranſlated above Seventy of his Books, and thought he could not employ his Time better than in enriching the *Latin* Tongue with the Works of *the beſt Writer and firſt Doctor of the Church after the Apoſtles* [c], as he then ſtyled him. As *Ruffinus*, in his Tranſlation of the *Periarchon*, endeavoured to excuſe the Errors of *Origen*, ſo had *Jerom* done before him in tranſlating his other Works, chuſing rather to *veil and excuſe*, than expoſe the Faults of one whom in other reſpects he ſo much admired [d]. But this Admiration being afterwards changed into an open and avowed Enmity, *the firſt Doctor of the Church after the Apoſtles* became at once not only an *heterodox*, but an *impious Writer*; all who ſtood up in his Defence were arraigned of the ſame *peſtilential Doctrines*; and what was found amiſs in his Works was no longer *veiled* or *excuſed*, but ſet out in the worſt Light (D).

Origen *excuſed by ſome of the Fathers, and once by* Jerom *himſelf.*

But

[w] Apol. pro Orig. apud Hier. t. 4. p. 194, 195. & præf. ad Periarch. [x] Phot. c. 118. [y] Athan. de Nicæn. decret. p. 277. Concil. t. 5. p. 652. Phot. c. 232. [z] Concil. t. 5. p. 653. [a] Phot. c. 232. & Nyſſ. in Cant. t. 1. p. 473. [b] Naz. or. 31. [c] Hier. de nom. Heb. p. 299. [d] Hier. ep. 65.

(D) Some of the Fathers would not allow even his Doctrine concerning the Trinity to be heterodox. For ſome Paſſages being quoted out of his Works by the *Arians* to confirm their Opinions, *Baſil* and *Nazianzen* undertook to prove, from other Paſſages, that his Sentiments with reſpect to the Trinity were quite orthodox; and that the *Arians* had either out of Malice miſinterpreted, or out of Ignorance miſunderſtood, his Meaning, not being capable of fathoming the Depth of his Thoughts (1). It muſt be owned, that *Origen*, in ſeveral Places, ſpeaks of the Trinity agreeably to the Sentiments of the Church, acknowleging *the Son to have been from the Beginning in the Father*; *to be the Image of the Father*; *to have been begotten by him from all Eternity*; *to be the Wiſdom of God*; *to be God, though not the Source and Origin of the Divinity, as the Father, whom on that Account he ſtyles* Autotheos; *to be above all Creatures*; *to have the ſame Power as the Father, and to deſerve the ſame Honour and Worſhip*. But elſewhere he uſes Expreſſions that can no-way bear an orthodox Senſe, *viz.* that *the* Verb *is an Hypoſtaſis different from the Father*; meaning, by the Word *Hypoſtaſis*, Nature and Subſtance; *that the Father and Son are One by Concord and Uni-*

(1) Socr. l. 4. c. 26.

;

But what seems most of all surprising, and quite unaccountable, in the Conduct of that Father, is, that though he had with so much Noise procured *Origen* to be condemned as an Heretic, and his Books to be prohibited, particularly his *Periarchon*, or, as some will have it, the *Periarchon* alone, as containing most of his heretical Tenets; yet, in a private Letter to *Paulinus*, he refers him to that very Piece for the Decision of some Questions of the greatest Importance [e]. But to return to *Anastasius*:

The Bishops of Africa *apply to* Anastasius *and* Venerius *of* Milan.

The same Year 401. in which *Origen* was condemned, the Churches of *Africa* being greatly distressed for want of Ecclesiastics, the Bishops of the Province of *Carthage*, assembling under *Aurelius* Bishop of that City, resolved to dispatch one of their Body into *Italy* to acquaint *Anastasius*, and *Venerius* Bishop of *Milan*, with the Condition of the *African* Churches, and implore their Assistance [f]. Which of the Bishops was charged with this Legation, or what Success attended it, we are no-where told. But as *Paulinus*, who afterwards wrote the Life of St. *Ambrose*, and belonged to the Church of *Milan*, was at this Time sent into *Africa*, and continued there, some have not improbably conjectured, that *Venerius* at least assisted his Collegues in *Africa* with a Supply of as many Ecclesiastics as he could spare. *Baronius* supposes *Anastasius* to have relieved those Churches with the like Supply; but this Supposition he builds upon the paternal Care which *Anastasius* had, as *universal Pastor*, of all the Catholic Churches [g], which is building on a false Foundation.

Anastasius *advises the Bishops of* Africa *not to dissemble the Cruelties of the* Donatists.

The same Year another Council was held at *Carthage*, consisting of all the Bishops of *Africa*; and *Aurelius*, who presided in this, as he had done in the former, opened it with reading a Letter from *Anastasius*, exhorting the Bishops of *Africa* no longer to dissemble the

[e] Hier. ep. 153. [f] Concil. t. 2. p. 1642. [g] Bar. ad ann. 401. n. 7.

on; that the Son is not properly God, but called God, because he is the Image of the Divinity; that the Verb and the Holy Ghost were made by the Father; that the Father is greater than the Son; that the Son is inferior to the Father, though far above all Creatures, as the Ray of the Sun is inferior to the Sun; and lastly, *that the Son is the Minister of the Father*. In these Passages is contained a very different Doctrine from that which is laid down in those I have quoted above; and hence some of the Friends of *Origen*, and among the rest *Ruffinus*, concluded the latter Passages to have been foisted in by the *Arians*, denying the Divinity of the Verb; while others, allowing them to be *Origen*'s, undertook to explain them in a Catholic Sense, in Opposition to the *Arians* confirming their Doctrine with the Authority of so eminent a Writer. But his Enemies, attending only to the Passages where he seemed to establish an Inequality in the Trinity, not only condemned him as an Heretic, but all who stood up in his Defence, or attempted to interpret his Words in a Catholic Sense.

Cruelties of the *Donatiſts*, who continued to uſe with great Barbarity the Catholic Biſhops and Clergy [h]. The Fathers of the Council returned *Anaſtaſius* Thanks for his Advice; but, not thinking it quite agreeable to the true Spirit of Chriſtianity, they declined complying with it. They knew that their Perſecutors, had they complained of their Cruelties to the Civil Magiſtrate, would have been puniſhed with Death, purſuant to a Law enacted againſt them, Three Years before, by the Emperors *Arcadius* and *Honorius* [i]. They therefore choſe, notwithſtanding the Advice of *Anaſtaſius*, rather to ſuffer with Patience a moſt cruel Perſecution, than redeem themſelves from it at ſo dear a Rate [k]. In the ſame Council it was decreed, among other things, that ſuch of the *Donatiſt* Clergy, as ſhould return to the Church, might be admitted, if the Biſhop, who received them, thought it expedient, to the ſame Rank, which they had enjoyed before their Converſion. As a Decree had been lately enacted by *Anaſtaſius*, and the other *Italian* Biſhops, excluding converted Heretics from the Catholic Clergy [l]; it was to acquaint them with the Motives which had prompted the Fathers, aſſembled at *Carthage*, to admit the *Donatiſts*, that *Aurelius* and his Collegues wrote to *Anaſtaſius*; and not to beg of him a Diſpenſation in favour of the converted *Donatiſts*, as is ridiculouſly ſuppoſed by *Baronius* [m].

Who refuſe to comply with his Advice.

This is all I find recorded of *Anaſtaſius*, by the antient Writers. He died on the 27th of *April* 402. after having held the See of *Rome* Four Years, One Month, and Thirteen Days. *Jerom*, with whom he ſided againſt *Ruffinus*, and the other Friends of *Origen*, diſtinguiſhes him with the Title of an *eminent Man*; and adds, *that* Rome *did not deſerve to enjoy him long, leſt the Head of the World ſhould be cut off under ſuch a Biſhop; nay, he was ſnatched away*, ſays he, *leſt he ſhould ſtrive to ward off, with his Prayers, the Execution of the Sentence that was already pronounced; the Lord ſaying to* Jeremiah, *Pray not for this People for their Good: when they faſt I will not hear their Cry*, &c [n]. *Jerom* ſpeaks there of the Calamities that befel *Rome* Seven Years after, when it was taken by the *Goths*, under *Alaric*. *Theophylus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, not only an avowed Enemy to *Origen*, but a cruel Perſecutor of all who ſtood up in his Defence, extols *Anaſtaſius* for his

Anaſtaſius *dies.*

Is greatly commended by Jerom.

[h] Concil. t. 1. inter Concil. Afr. c. 33. & Greg. l. 1. ep. 53. [i] Cod. Theod. l. 3. de epiſc. & cler. [k] Aug. ep. 127. [l] Concil. t. 2. p. 1642. [m] Bar. ad ann. 401. n. 14. [n] Hier. ep. 16. Jerem. c. 14. ver. 11, 12.

paſtoral

pastoral Care, and indefatigable Pains, in preserving and maintaining the Purity of the Catholic Faith [b]; alluding, no doubt, to his acting in Concert with him, against *Origen*, and the pretended *Origenists*. Be that as it will, *Anastasius* is now honoured as a Saint by the Church of *Rome*; and the Honours paid him are chiefly owing to the Commendations of *Jerom* and *Theophylus*, whose Party he so warmly espoused. As to the Writings of *Anastasius*, Mention is made, by *Jerom*, of several Letters written by him on different Occasions; but that alone has reached our Times, which he wrote to *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and some Fragments of another to one *Ursinus*, on the *Incarnation* (A).

Is honoured as a Saint.

Baronius observes, at the Death of *Syricius* [c], that such Popes as did not, through Sloth and Indolence, exert the due Zeal in extirpating the heterodox Opinions that sprung up in the Church, that is, such Popes as did not exterminate all, who differed in Opinion from them, have been quickly cut off, to make room for other more zealous Asserters of the Purity of the Faith. An ill-timed Observation! which I might retort here, were I inclined to indulge such a Humour, since the *indolent Syricius* enjoyed his Dignity Thirteen Years (and not very many have enjoyed it longer), and the *very zealous Anastasius* only Four.

An ill-timed Observation of Baronius.

[b] Justin. in ep. ad Menam. [c] Ad ann. 397. num. 21.

(A) The Two Decretals that have been transmitted to us under his Name, are evidently suppositious, the one being dated Fourteen Years before his Election, and the other Fourteen Years after his Death. One of these pretended Decretals is addressed to the *German* and *Burgundian* Bishops, tho' nothing is more certain, than that the *Burgundians* were not converted to the Christian Religion till many Years after his Death, till the Year 436. if *Socrates* is to credited (1). They are both made up of several Passages taken from the Letters of *Innocent*, *Leo*, *Gregory*, and others; and were, in all Likelihood, forged, as many others have been, by *Isidorus Mercator*.

(1) Socr. l. 7. c. 30.

INNOCENT,

ARCADIUS, HONORIUS,

INNOCENT,

THEODOSIUS *the younger.*

Thirty-ninth BISHOP *of* Rome.

ON the Demiſe of *Anaſtaſius*, *Innocent* was immediately, and with one Conſent, choſen by the Clergy, and the People [a]. He was, according to *Anaſtaſius* [b], a Native of *Albano*, and the Son of another *Innocent*; but, according to *Jerom*, both the Son and Succeſſor of *Anaſtaſius* [c]. *Theodoret* ſtyles him a Man of great Addreſs, and a lively Genius [d]; *Proſper*, a worthy Succeſſor of St. *Peter* [e]; and *Auſtin* diſtinguiſhes him, after his Death, with the Title of the *Bleſſed* Innocent [f]. *Oroſius* ſays, that God withdrew that holy Biſhop from *Rome*, when the City was taken, as he did *Lot* from *Sodom* [g]; and *Jerom*, in writing to *Demetrias*, exhorts her to adhere ſteadily to the Faith of *Innocent* [h]. *Auſtin*, in the Letter he wrote to him in the Name of the Council of *Milevum*, aſcribes his Election to a particular Providence; and adds, that the Fathers of the Council thought it a Duty incumbent upon them to ſuggeſt to him what might be done for the Good of the Church, ſince they could not think him capable of hearing any thing of that Nature with Contempt or Indifference [i].

Year of Chriſt 402.

The Election of Innocent, *commended by the Antients.*

Innocent was no ſooner choſen and ordained, than he wrote to *Anyſius* of *Theſſalonica*, acquainting him with his Election, and charging him, as his Three immediate Predeceſſors had done, with the Care of the Churches of *Eaſt Illyricum* [k]. In the End of the following Year 403. the Emperor *Honorius* viſited the City of *Rome*; and, during his Stay there, *Innocent* went frequently to wait on him, in order to obtain, in Behalf of ſome Biſhops, and other Eccleſiaſtics, an Exemption from executing certain Civil Offices hereditary in their Families. He ſucceeded in his Suit, but it coſt him a great deal of Trouble and Uneaſineſs [l]. *Victricius*, Biſhop of *Rouen*, who happened to be then at *Rome*, having applied to him for Information, with reſpect to the Practice and Diſcipline of the *Roman* Church, *Innocent*, to gratify him, and *that he might not ſeem to approve, by*

He writes to Anyſius *of* Theſſalonica.

Innocent's Letter to Victricius.

[a] Collect. Rem. ab Holſten. p. 45. [b] Anaſt. c. 41. [c] Hier. ep. 8. [d] Theod. l. 5. c. 35. [e] Proſp. in Col. c. 10. [f] Pec. orig. c. 9. [g] Oroſ. l. 7. c. 39. [h] Hier. ubi ſupra. [i] Aug. ep. 92. [k] Coll. Rom. p. 46, 47. [l] Conc. t. 2. p. 1252.

his Silence, the Abuſes that prevailed in ſome Churches, ſent him a *Book of Rules*, as he ſtyled it, containing ſeveral Regulations, which had been originally eſtabliſhed, ſays he, by the Authority of the Apoſtles and Fathers, but were now, in many Places, either quite unknown, or utterly neglected. He therefore intreats *Victricius* to communicate them to the neighbouring Churches and Biſhops, that they might be acquainted with the Diſcipline of the *Roman* Church, and conform to it in inſtructing the new-converted Chriſtians [m].

The Articles it contains.

This *Book of Rules* contains Thirteen Regulations relating to different Points of Diſcipline, whereof the Firſt forbids, and declares uncanonical, the Ordination of Biſhops without the Knowlege and Approbation of their Metropolitans. The Second excludes from the Clerical Order ſuch as have ſerved, or ſhall continue to ſerve, in War after Baptiſm. The Third orders all Differences and Diſputes, ariſing among the Eccleſiaſtics, to be decided by the Biſhops of the Provinces, *ſaving the Rights of the* Roman *Church* (A); and commands thoſe to be depoſed who ſhall recur to other Tribunals, except in Cauſes of the greateſt Importance, when, after the Biſhops have given Sentence, Recourſe may be had to the Apoſtolical See, purſuant to the Order of the Council; meaning, no doubt, the Council of *Sardica* [n]. The Three next relate to thoſe who ſhall have married a Widow, a Woman that has been divorced, or a ſecond Wife, either before or after Baptiſm; and they are all alike declared incapable of being ever admitted among the Clergy. The Seventh forbids Biſhops to ordain Clerks of another Church, without the Permiſſion of their own Biſhops, or to admit thoſe to ſerve one Church, who have been depoſed in another. The Eighth allows the *Novatians* and *Donatiſts*, who return to the Church, to be readmitted by the bare Impoſition of Hands; but ſubjects thoſe to a long Penance, who had quitted the Church to be rebaptized by them. The Ninth relates to the Celibacy of the Prieſts and Deacons, who are debarred by it from all Commerce with their Wives, after Ordination. The inferior Clergy were allowed to marry; but *Innocent*, by the Tenth Article of the preſent Letter, excepts thoſe who, before they were admitted among the Clergy, had lived in Monaſteries, and profeſſed Continence there; it being fit, ſays he, they ſhould obſerve in a

[m] Ibid. p. 1249. [n] See above, p. 120, 121.

(A) In ſome Editions this Clauſe is wanting.

higher

higher Rank what they had obſerved when only Monks. In the ſame Article he obſerves, that thoſe, who had loſt their Virginity before Marriage, did not receive the Bleſſing of the Church when they afterwards married; and that it was the antient Practice of the Church, that ſuch as had loſt it before Baptiſm, ſhould promiſe, before they were admitted to the Clerical Order, never to marry. The Eleventh forbids thoſe to be ordained, who were not exempted from all Civil Offices and Employments, ſuch Offices diverting them from the Functions of the Prieſthood, and ſometimes obliging them to exhibit Shews and public Sports, of which the Devil was, without all Doubt, the Author and Promoter. The Twelfth forbids Women, who have married a Second Husband, their Firſt being ſtill alive, to be admitted to Repentance, or allowed to do Penance till one of the Two dies. The ſame Diſcipline is to be obſerved, according to this Article, with reſpect to the Virgins, who, after conſecrating their Virginity to *Jeſus Chriſt*, ſhall, either by a public Marriage, or by private Fornication, violate the Faith they had pledged to their immortal Spouſe.

Innocent thinks the Marriage of a Woman with another Man valid, while her Husband is ſtill alive.

Baronius [o], to anſwer the Objections which ſome *Innovators*, as he is pleaſed to ſtyle them, have offered againſt the unchriſtian Severity of this Article, tells us, that the Repentance of ſuch a Virgin can by no means be ſincere, ſo long as ſhe continues with the Man ſhe married; which is quite foreign to the Purpoſe, ſince *Innocent* excludes her from Repentance, not only ſo long as ſhe lives with him, but ſo long as he lives. *Innocent* knew what *Baronius* ſeems not to have known; *viz.* that the Marriage of Virgins, however ſolemnly conſecrated, held good, even according to the Practice of the *Roman* Church [p]; and, conſequently, that they could not abandon their Husbands; and hence he would not admit them to Repentance, or the Participation of the Sacred Myſteries, till the Death of their Husbands; which was keeping them, as it were, in a State of Excommunication, without any poſſible Means of redeeming themſelves from it. And it is this uncharitable Severity, which ſome Divines of the *Reformed Churches* have deſervedly blamed. *Baronius* ſtigmatizes ſuch Marriages with the Name of *Adultery*; but he confounds the Time of *Innocent* with his own; for, in his Time, the Vow of Chaſtity was declared a true Marriage, and, conſequently,

The unchriſtian Severity of one of theſe Articles ill excuſed by Baronius.

[o] Bar. ad ann. 404. num. 130. [p] See Natal. Alex. hiſt. eccleſ. t. 10. p. 14.

every ſubſequent Marriage void and null; but, in *Innocent*'s Time, the Marriage of a ſacred Virgin was held valid, though commonly deemed ſinful. Whether it be ſinful or no, or whether a Vow of that kind can be lawfully made, I ſhall not take upon me to determine here; but I am very confident, that of moſt Perſons, who debar themſelves by a ſolemn Vow from ever marrying, we may ſay, with the Fathers of the Eighth Council of *Toledo*, that *they had better break a Vow, which they had raſhly made, than fill up, by obſerving it, the Meaſure of their Sins.*

But to return to the Letter: The Thirteenth and laſt Article will have thoſe Virgins to do Penance for ſome time, who ſhall marry after having promiſed to live Virgins, though they had not yet received the Sacred Veil [q]. This Letter has been inſerted by *Dionyſius Exiguus*, in his Code of the *Roman* Church, and is quoted by the Second Council of *Tours*, held in 567 [r]. and by ſeveral other Councils [s] (A).

[q] Conc. t. 2. p. 1249—1252. [r] Concil. t. 5. p. 858. & 866. [s] See Blond. Decr. p. 551.

(A) And yet ſome have been induced by the Date it bears, to queſtion its Authenticity. For it is dated the 15th of *February* 404. Now, it is manifeſt, ſay they, from the Letter itſelf, that *Victricius* was at *Rome* while the Emperor *Honorius* was there; and it is no leſs certain, that *Honorius* did not arrive at *Rome* till the Month of *December* 403. If therefore *Victricius* was at *Rome* in *December* 403. it is not at all probable, that *Innocent* ſhould have wrote to him on the 15th of *February* 404. To ſolve this Difficulty, ſome ſuppoſe *Victricius* to have applied to *Innocent*, while he was ſtill at *Rome*; and *Innocent*, inſtead of informing him, as he might, by Word of Mouth, to have given him in Writing the deſired Inſtructions, that, having thus more Weight, they might the more readily be complied with by other Biſhops. But it is manifeſt, from *Innocent*'s Words, that his Letter was an Anſwer to one from *Victricius*; and we cannot well ſuppoſe *Victricius*, who was at *Rome* in *December*, to have returned to *Rouen*, to have wrote from thence to *Innocent*, and *Innocent* to have returned him ſo full an Anſwer by the 15th of the following *January*. We may conclude the Year to have been, by ſome Miſtake, altered, and 404. inſerted in the Date inſtead of 405. ſince the Letter could not be written earlier, as I have juſt obſerved, than the Month of *January* (if *January* was the true Month) of the latter Year; and we have no Reaſon to think it was written later. The Miſtake as to the Year might have been occaſioned by the Tranſcriber's omitting P. C. *Poſt Conſulatum Honorii*, and thereby confounding the Year of the Emperor's Sixth Conſulſhip 404. with the Year after it 405.— Such Omiſſions frequently occur, and have led Writers, not aware of them, into great Miſtakes, in point of Chronology, or made them ſuſpect, nay, and condemn, as ſpurious, the moſt authentic Pieces of Hiſtory. This Letter, in ſome Editions, bears no Date; and F. *Labbé* aſſures us, that he has ſeen a manuſcript Copy of it, in which the Date was wanting. Some therefore ſuppoſe the Date to have been afterwards added, nay, and the whole Concluſion of the Letter. For *Innocent* cloſes it by ſaying, that the Obſervance of the Rules it contains will baniſh all Ambition among the Biſhops, compoſe all Differences, prevent all Schiſms, and leave no room for the Devil to inſult the Flock of Chriſt. A Concluſion taken probably from ſome other Piece, and not at all adapted or applicable, with Truth, to this.

In

In the Year 404. *Auſtin* wrote to *Innocent*, in the Name of the Biſhops aſſembled in Council at *Carthage*, intreating him to apply to *Honorius* for new Laws againſt the *Donatiſts*; whoſe Cruelties towards the Orthodox, if not magnified by *Auſtin* [u], are ſcarce to be matched in Hiſtory. The Emperor hearkened to *Innocent*'s Remonſtrances, and ſevere Laws being iſſued againſt them, they began by that means to be convinced of their Errors, and to return daily in great Numbers to the Unity of the Church. This is what we read in one of *Auſtin*'s Letters [w]; for the *Donatiſts*, as he would make us believe, finding themſelves perſecuted, began to inquire, which they had never done before, into the Grounds of the Religion, for which they ſuffered. This Inquiry had the deſired Effect; their Eyes were opened; they diſcovered the Errors of their Sect; and, being ſenſible of their Folly in foregoing any temporal Advantage, or expoſing themſelves to the leaſt Inconvenience, for the ſake of ſuch a Religion, they ſincerely abjured it, and zealouſly embraced the Catholic Faith. An ingenious Turn, I muſt own, to excuſe, nay, and to authorize and ſanctify, the greateſt Barbarities! But daily Experience teaches us, that Perſecution has a contrary Effect, and that the more Men are perſecuted, the more obſtinately they adhere to the Opinions, however abſurd, for which they ſuffer; witneſs the great Number of Martyrs which almoſt every Church, as well as the Catholic, can boaſt of. And, where it has not that Effect, the moſt it can do is to make Men become Hypocrites, and profeſs a Religion they do not believe, but ſcarce ever changes their Hearts, or brings any to a ſincere and efficacious Aſſent to a Faith which is thus violently forced on their Minds.

Letter of the Council of Carthage *to* Innocent.

About the ſame time, or not long after, *Innocent* wrote to the Biſhops of *Spain*; and the chief Articles of his Letter were: 1. That they ought to cut off from their Communion ſuch of their Brethren as refuſed to communicate with *Symphoſius*, *Dictinius*, and other Biſhops, who, having renounced the Errors of *Priſcillian*, had been re-admitted to the Communion of the Church by the Council held at *Toledo*, in the Year 400 [x]. 2. That thoſe Biſhops ſhould be depoſed who had been ordained without the Knowlege or Conſent of their Metropolitan. 3. That ſuch as preſumed to ordain againſt the Canons ſhould be likewiſe depoſed, and all who had been thus ordained by them.

Innocent *writes to the Biſhops of* Spain.

[u] Aug. ep. 50. [w] Idem ibid. [x] See above, p. 247.

Chryſoſtom *Biſhop of* Conſtantinople *recurs to* Innocent.

Chryſoſtom, the celebrated Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, having been unjuſtly depoſed in 403. and driven from his See by *Theophylus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and the Council *ad Quercum*, or at *the Oak*, near *Chalcedon*, had, upon his Return to *Conſtantinople*, inſiſted upon a Council being ſummoned, to make his Innocence the more plainly appear to the World. This *Theophylus*, and the Biſhops of his Party, not only ſtrenuouſly oppoſed, but, by the great Intereſt they had at Court, prevailed upon the Emperor *Arcadius* to drive him from *Conſtantinople* a Second time, and baniſh him to *Cucuſus*, an inhoſpitable Place in *Cilicia*. The News of theſe laſt Proceedings had not yet reached *Rome*, when *Theophylus* ſent one of his Lectors with a Letter to *Innocent*, acquainting him, that he had depoſed *Chryſoſtom*. As, in this Letter, *Theophylus* obſerved an intire Silence with reſpect to the Motives that had prompted him to take ſuch a Step, *Innocent* prudently forbore returning him an Anſwer. There happened to be then at *Rome* a Deacon of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, who, hearing what *Theophylus* had wrote, went immediately, and warned *Innocent* to be upon his Guard, intreating him at the ſame time, not to proceed but with the utmoſt Caution, in ſo nice and important an Affair, and aſſuring him, that the Truth could not remain long undiſcovered. Accordingly, in Three Days, *Panſovius*, and Three other Biſhops, arrived at *Rome*, with Three Letters for *Innocent*; *viz.* one from *Chryſoſtom* himſelf, another from the Biſhops of his Communion, and the Third from the whole Clergy of *Conſtantinople*. *Chryſoſtom* in his Letter, which is ſtill to be ſeen in his Works, and in thoſe of *Palladius*, who wrote the Hiſtory of his Perſecution, after giving *Innocent* an Account of the Storm his Enemies had raiſed againſt him, intreats him to declare ſuch wicked Proceedings void and null, to pronounce all who had any Share in them puniſhable, according to the Eccleſiaſtical Laws, and to continue to him the Marks of his Charity and Communion. In the Title and Cloſe of the Letter, he addreſſes himſelf to one, but every-where elſe to more Perſons, the Letter having been wrote, as appears from the Copy in *Palladius* [y], not to *Innocent* alone, but to him, to *Venerius* of *Milan*, and *Chromatius* of *Aquileia*, Biſhops of the Three chief Sees in the Weſt.

Innocent's *Anſwer to* Chryſoſtom's *Letter.*

Innocent, acting with his uſual Prudence and Circumſpection, in his Anſwer to the above-mentioned Letters, declared, that he ad-

[y] Pall. Dial. c. 2.

mitted

mitted the Biſhops of both Parties to his Communion, from which he could exclude no Man till he was lawfully judged and condemned; and that therefore, to compoſe all Differences, and leave no room for Complaints on either Side, it was fit a Council ſhould be aſſembled, conſiſting of the Weſtern as well as the Eaſtern Biſhops. The other Biſhops of *Italy*, to whom *Chryſoſtom* had wrote, returned much the ſame Anſwer [z], following therein the Advice, which *Chryſoſtom* himſelf had given to the Biſhops of his Party; *viz.* that they ſhould communicate with his Enemies, to prevent Diviſions in the Church, but not ſign his Condemnation, becauſe he did not think himſelf guilty [a]. *Innocent*'s Anſwer to *Theophylus* was in Words to the ſame Effect. His Letter to *Chryſoſtom* was carried into the Eaſt by *Demetrius* Biſhop of *Peſſinus*, who took care to ſhew it every-where, to the end it might be every-where known, that the *Roman* Church ſtill communicated with that holy Biſhop [b].

Theophylus *writes to* Innocent.

A few Days after *Innocent* had anſwered *Chryſoſtom*'s Letter, *Petrus*, one of *Theophylus*'s Presbyters, and *Martyrius* Deacon of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, arrived at *Rome*, with Letters from *Theophylus*, and the Acts of *Chryſoſtom*'s Depoſition by the Council *ad Quercum*. From theſe it appeared, that the Council had conſiſted of Thirty-ſix Biſhops, whereof Twenty-nine were *Egyptians*, and over theſe *Theophylus* had, as their Metropolitan, too great an Influence; that *Chryſoſtom* had been condemned without being heard, and that nothing had been laid to his Charge, deſerving ſo ſevere and exemplary a Puniſhment. *Innocent* therefore, having read them, with the utmoſt Indignation, anſwered *Theophylus* in a few Words; that he was determined, as he had notified to him by his former Letter, to communicate both with him and his Brother *John*; that he could by no means depart from the Communion of the latter, till he was lawfully judged and condemned; that a Council was to be ſoon held, before which it was incumbent upon *Theophylus* to make good his Charge, and the Steps he had hitherto taken, by the Canons and Decrees of the Council of *Nice*, ſince the *Roman* Church admitted no others [c]. With this Letter *Petrus* and *Martyrius* returned to *Conſtantinople*, whence arrived at *Rome*, ſoon after their Departure from that City, *Theoctecnus*, a Presbyter of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, and one of *Chryſoſtom*'s Friends, with Letters from Twenty-five Biſhops,

Innocent's *Anſwer to* Theophylus

Letters from the Biſhops of Chryſoſtom's *Party to* Innocent.

[z] Idem ib. c. 8. [a] Idem ib. [b] Idem ib. c. 3. [c] Idem ib.

ſhops, informing *Innocent*, that *Chryſoſtom* had been driven a Second time from his See; that he had been conducted by a Band of Soldiers to *Cucuſus*, and confined to that Place; and that the great Church had been conſumed by Fire, the very Day he was carried out of *Conſtantinople*. *Innocent* was greatly affected with this Account, and ſhed many Tears in reading it. But as theſe Troubles and Diſorders were fomented by ſome great Men, at the Court either of *Arcadius* or *Honorius*, and a Miſunderſtanding was then ſubſiſting between the Two Brothers, or their Miniſters, he concluded, that his Endeavours towards the reſtoring of Peace and Unity would prove unſucceſsful, and might even blow the Fire, which already burnt with ſo much Violence, into a greater Flame. On theſe Conſiderations he wiſely forbore making any Application for the preſent to *Honorius*, and only ſent Letters of Communion to *Chryſoſtom*, and the Biſhops, who had eſpouſed his Cauſe[d]. Theſe Letters were delivered to *Theoctecnus*, who was ſcarce gone, when one *Paternus*, who ſtyled himſelf a Presbyter of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, arrived at *Rome*, with Letters from *Acacius*, who had been intruded into the See of *Conſtantinople*, and from ſome other Biſhops of his Party, charging *Chryſoſtom* with ſetting Fire to the *Baſilic* or Great Church. So barefaced a Calumny provoked *Innocent* to ſuch a Degree, that he would neither hear *Paternus*, nor return an Anſwer to the Letters he had brought.

Who ſends Letters of Communion to them.

Letters from Acacius *to* Innocent.

In the mean time a moſt cruel Perſecution was raiſed at *Conſtantinople*, againſt *Chryſoſtom*'s Friends, refuſing to communicate with *Acacius*, *Theophylus*, and *Porphyrius*, who had intruded himſelf into the vacant See of *Antioch*, and, in Defiance of the Canons, maintained, by Force of Arms, the Dignity he had uſurped. This Perſecution was carried on under a Chriſtian Emperor, with as much Cruelty as any had ever been under the moſt inveterate Enemies of the Chriſtian Name. The Pretence they made uſe of was to diſcover the Authors of the late Fire; and as the Imperial Officers chiefly ſuſpected, or pretended to ſuſpect, *Chryſoſtom*'s Friends, *Optatus*, who was then Prefect or Governor of *Conſtantinople*, and a Pagan, laid hold of that Opportunity to vent upon them the implacable Hatred he bore to the Religion they profeſſed. Many therefore, without Diſtinction of Sex or Condition, were, by his Orders, dragged to the

Chryſoſtom's *Friends cruelly perecuted.*

[d] Pallad. ibid. c. 2.

public

public Gaols, and confined there to Dungeons, others tormented with ſuch Barbarity as to expire on the Rack; and great Numbers, after having undergone repeated Tortures, ſtript of all their Effects, and baniſhed to the moſt remote and deſolate Places of the Empire.

At the ſame time the Emperor *Arcadius*, ſtrangely prepoſſeſſed againſt *Chryſoſtom*, and thoſe of his Communion, cauſed Two Edicts to be publiſhed; the one directed to the Governors of the Provinces, whom he ſtrictly injoined not to ſuffer, in their reſpective Juriſdictions, any private Aſſemblies or Meetings of Perſons, who, deſpiſing the Churches, worſhiped elſewhere, leſt they ſhould ſeem to communicate with *the moſt Reverend Prelates of the holy Law, Arſacius, Theophylus*, and *Porphyrius*. The other commanded ſuch Biſhops as refuſed to communicate with them, to be driven from their Sees, and their Effects to be ſeized. The Perſecution, which ſtill raged, though it was ſoon after ſtopt at the Remonſtrances of *Studius* the *Præfectus Prætorio*, and the Severity, with which the Two Imperial Edicts were put in Execution, drove great Numbers, both of the Clergy and Laity, from *Conſtantinople*, and the Provinces ſubject to *Arcadius*. Among the former were *Cyriacus* Biſhop of *Synnada*, *Eulyſius* of *Apamea* in *Bithynia*, *Palladius* of *Helenopolis*, *Germanus* a Presbyter, and *Caſſianus* a Deacon, who afterwards embraced the Monaſtic Life, and became famous for his Aſcetic Writings. *Eulyſius* brought Letters to *Innocent* from Fifteen Biſhops of *Chryſoſtom*'s Communion, acquainting him with the deplorable State of the *Conſtantinopolitan* Church, and one from *Anyſius* of *Theſſalonica*, declaring, that in the preſent unhappy Diviſions, he had reſolved to conform intirely to the Sentiments of the *Roman* Church. *Germanus* and *Caſſianus* likewiſe delivered Letters to *Innocent*, written in the Name of the whole Clergy of *Conſtantinople*, and giving him an Account of the Perſecution that ſtill raged, and of the cruel Treatment their Biſhop had met with [a]. *Innocent*, in his Anſwer to this Letter, expreſſes, in the moſt pathetic Terms, his Concern for the unhappy State of that Church, and their Sufferings; he encourages them to bear, with Patience, their preſent Tribulation and Afflictions, nay, and with Joy, ſince it is for the ſake of Juſtice they ſuffer, and are thus perſecuted: he complains of the undue Depoſition of his Collegue, and Inſtallation of another in his Life-time, which he ſhews to be againſt the Canons of the Council

Many fly to Rome.

Several Biſhops, and the whole Clergy of Conſtantinople *write to* Innocent.

His Anſwer to the Clergy.

[a] Pall. ubi ſupra. Soz. l. 8. c. 26. Hiſt. Lauſiac. c. 121.

of *Nice*, the only Canons admitted and obeyed by the *Roman* Church: he concludes with informing them, that as he had always thought it neceſſary, that an Oecumenical Council ſhould aſſemble, he had long conſidered, and was ſtill conſidering, by what Means it might be aſſembled, *ſince a Council, and nothing elſe, could appeaſe ſo violent a Storm*, and reſtore to the Church the ſo much wiſhed for Tranquillity [b].

Innocent *applies to* Honorius;

Two Presbyters in the mean time came to *Rome* from the Eaſt, *Domitianus* of *Conſtantinople*, and *Vallagus* of *Niſibis* in *Meſopotamia*, and brought with them the original Acts, which they had purchaſed with a large Sum, of the Imperial Officers, containing an authentic Detail of the Cruelties which ſome Women of Quality had been made to endure for not communicating with *Arſacius*, and the Biſhops of his Faction. With theſe the good Biſhop was ſo deeply affected, that he could no longer forbear applying to *Honorius*, who, at his Requeſt, wrote immediately to *Arcadius* a very preſſing and friendly Letter in favour of *Chryſoſtom*, and thoſe of his Communion. At the ſame time he iſſued an Order for convening a Council of the Weſtern Biſhops, who, meeting ſoon after at *Rome*, drew up an Addreſs, which they ſent to *Ravenna*, where the Emperor then was, earneſtly intreating him to interpoſe anew his good Offices with his Brother *Arcadius*, that an Oecumenical Council might be allowed to aſſemble at *Theſſalonica*, in order to compoſe the preſent Differences, which had already produced a Miſunderſtanding between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches, and might in the End bring on an intire Separation. *Ho-*

who writes to Arcadius.

norius, in Compliance with their Requeſt, wrote a Third Letter to *Arcadius* (for he had, it ſeems, wrote already a Second), and at the ſame time one to *Innocent*, deſiring him to appoint Five Biſhops, Two Presbyters of the *Roman* Church, and One Deacon, to carry his Letter into the Eaſt, thinking that ſuch a Legation would add no ſmall Weight to his Mediation. The Letter to *Arcadius* was in the following Terms:

His Letter.

" This is the Third time I write to your Meekneſs (*ad Manſuetu-*
" *dinem tuam*) intreating you to correct and rectify the iniquitous
" Proceedings that have been carried on againſt *John* Biſhop of *Con-*
" *ſtantinople*. But nothing, I find, has been hitherto done in his Be-
" half. Having therefore much at Heart the Peace of the Church,

[b] Soz. ubi ſupra, & ep. Rom. Pont. Inn. 15.

" which

" which will be attended with that of our Empire, I write to you " anew by theſe holy Biſhops and Presbyters, earneſtly deſiring you " to command the Eaſtern Biſhops to aſſemble at *Theſſalonica*. The " Weſtern Biſhops have ſent Five of their Body, Two Presbyters of " the *Roman* Church, and One Deacon, all Men of the ſtricteſt Equity, " and quite free from the Byaſs of Favour and Hatred. Theſe I beg " you would receive with that Regard which is due to their Rank " and Merit: if they find *John* to have been juſtly depoſed, they may " ſeparate me from his Communion; and you from the Communion " of the Orientals, if it appears that he has been unjuſtly depoſed. " The Weſtern Biſhops have very plainly expreſſed their Sentiments, " in the many Letters they have wrote to me on the Subject of the " preſent Diſpute. Of theſe I ſend you Two, the one from the Bi- " ſhop of *Rome*, the other from the Biſhop of *Aquileia*, and with " them the reſt agree. One thing I muſt above all beg of your Meek- " neſs; that you oblige *Theophylus* of *Alexandria* to aſſiſt at the " Council, how averſe ſoever he may be to it; for he is ſaid to be " the firſt and chief Author of the preſent Calamities. Thus the Sy- " nod, meeting with no Delays or Obſtructions, will reſtore Peace " and Tranquillity in our Days [c]."

The Pope's Legates not allowed to touch at Theſſaloni-ca.

With theſe Letters the Legates ſet out from *Rome*, attended by the above-mentioned Prelates *Demetrius*, *Cyriacus*, *Eulyſius*, and *Palladius*; and, ſailing for *Greece*, put in at *Athens*, with a Deſign to purſue their Voyage to *Theſſalonica*, having Letters from *Innocent* to *Anyſius* Biſhop of that City. But at *Athens* they were, to their great Surprize, ſtopt and detained by a Military Tribune, who let them know that they muſt not touch at *Theſſalonica*; and at the ſame time appointed a Centurion as a Guard over them, ſtrictly injoining him not to ſuffer them, under any Pretence whatſoever, to approach that City. Soon after the Tribune parted them, and, putting them on board Two Veſſels, ordered the Mariners to convey them ſtrait to *Conſtantinople*. *Anyſius* communicated with *Chryſoſtom*, as I have obſerved above; and it was, without all doubt, on this Conſideration that the Legates were not allowed to ſet foot in his Dioceſe. They arrived at *Conſtantinople* the Third Day after they had left *Athens*, but ſtarved with Hunger; for the Tribune had neither ſupplied them with Proviſions when they embarked, nor allowed them Time to

The hard Uſage they met with on their Journey.

[c] Pall. ibid.

and at Constantinople.

ſupply themſelves; ſo that they had taſted no Kind of Victuals during the Three Days they were at Sea. On their Arrival at *Conſtantinople*, they were not ſuffered to come aſhore there, but ordered to a Caſtle on the *Thracian* Coaſt called *Athyra*, where they were all cloſely confined, the Legates in one common Room, and the other Biſhops in ſo many ſeparate Cells. As the People of *Conſtantinople* were moſt zealouſly attached to *Chryſoſtom*, the Emperor apprehended, and with a great deal of Reaſon, that their entering the City, and converſing publicly there, might be attended with uncommon Diſturbances and Commotions; and therefore thought it adviſeable to keep them at a Diſtance, and under Confinement. They had not been long thus confined, when they were ordered, they knew not by whom, to deliver the Letters they had brought. But neither by this Perſon, whoever he was, nor by ſeveral others, who were ſucceſſively ſent on the ſame Errand, could they be prevailed upon to part with them; alleging, that Letters from an Emperor ought to be delivered to none but an Emperor.

As they continued firm and unſhaken in this Reſolution, one *Valerian*, a Military Tribune, was at laſt called in, and ordered to employ the Rhetoric peculiar to his Profeſſion, ſince no other could prevail. *Valerian* accordingly, after a ſhort Preamble, proceeded to Violence; and, ſeizing them, took the Letters by Force, having in the Struggle wounded one of the Biſhops in the Hand. The next Day they were viſited by a Perſon, who, without acquainting them who he was, or by whom ſent, offered them a very conſiderable Sum, on condition they would communicate with *Atticus*, who, upon the Death of *Arſacius*, had, by the Biſhops of his Faction, been intruded in his room. Upon their rejecting, as they did with the utmoſt Indignation, this Offer, *Valerian*, who was preſent, conducted them under a ſtrong Guard to the Sea-ſide, and there put them on board an old leaky Veſſel, having firſt, with a large Bribe, prevailed upon the Commander, as they were informed, to engage his Word that they ſhould not outlive that Voyage. They outlived it however, and having reached *Lampſacus*, they embarked on board another Veſſel, which landed them ſafe at *Otranto*. As for the Eaſtern Biſhops, who had attended them from *Rome*, viz. *Cyriacus*, *Eulyſius*, *Palladius*, and *Demetrius*, after having been ſome time kept under cloſe Confinement at *Athyra*, they were baniſhed to the moſt remote and abandoned Places of the Empire. The other Biſhops, who refuſed to com-

The Letters taken from them by Force.

They are put on board a leaky Veſſel;

but arrive ſafe in Italy.

communicate with *Atticus*, *Theophylus*, and *Porphyrius*, fared no better, being in like-manner either driven into Baniſhment, or obliged to abſcond, and, under the Diſguiſe of Mechanics, earn their Livelihood by the meaneſt Profeſſions. Many periſhed in the Places of their Exile for want of Neceſſaries; and others were ſo cruelly haraſſed, nay, and barbarouſly beaten, by the mercileſs Soldiery appointed to conduct them, that they died on the Road [d]. Such were the wretched Effects of that unchriſtian Principle of Perſecution being lawful to puniſh Error in religious Diſputes, which all Sects of Chriſtians then held, and all ſuffered by in their Turns, as the different Parties among them got the Civil Magiſtrate and Force on their Side.

Honorius *reſolves to revenge the Affront offered to his Embaſſadors, but is diverted from it.*

Honorius, being informed of the baſe Treatment the Legates had met with, though veſted with the ſacred Character of Embaſſadors, was ſo provoked at ſuch a notorious Violation of the Right of Nations, that he reſolved to make War on his Brother, and revenge it by Force of Arms. But from this Reſolution he was diverted by a threatened Invaſion of the *Barbarians*, and the ſeaſonable Diſcovery of the famous *Stilicho*'s Treachery, which obliged him to keep all his Troops in *Italy*, or the adjoining Provinces. As for *Innocent*, finding the Mediation of *Honorius*, which he had procured, prove unſucceſsful, and no other Means left of affording the leaſt Relief to *Chryſoſtom* and the other perſecuted Biſhops, he reſolved to make known to the World his Abhorrence of the Evils, which it was not in his Power to redreſs; and accordingly ſeparated himſelf from the Communion of *Atticus*, *Theophylus*, and *Porphyrius*, as the chief Authors of the preſent Calamities [e].

Arcadius *and* Eudoxia *not excommunicated by* Innocent.

Baronius, thinking it inconſiſtent with the Dignity of his High Pontiff thus tamely to bear with the inſulting Conduct of *Arcadius*, would fain perſuade us, that, after he had tried in vain all other Methods of bringing the Emperor, and the Empreſs *Eudoxia*, to a Senſe of their Duty, he at laſt thought himſelf obliged to thunder againſt both the tremendous Sentence of Excommunication, cutting them off as rotten Members from the Body of the Faithful committed to his Care and Direction. To prove this, he produces ſeveral Letters from *Innocent* to *Arcadius*, and from *Arcadius* to *Innocent*, tranſcribed partly from *Gennadius*, *Glycas*, and *Nicephorus*, and partly from the *Vatican* Manuſcripts [f]. To enter into a critical Examination of thoſe

[d] Pall. in dial. ubi ſupra. [e] Idem ibidem. [f] Bar. ann. 407. n. 19—22.

Pieces,

Pieces would be waſting Time, and tiring the Reader to no Purpoſe. I ſhall therefore content myſelf with Three Obſervations, each of them ſufficient, in my Opinion, to make the World reject them all as mere Forgeries. In the firſt place, the Silence of the Hiſtorians, who wrote at that Time, touching ſo remarkable and unprecedented an Event as the Excommunication of an Emperor and an Empreſs, is an unanſwerable Confutation of every Proof that can be alleged to ſupport the Authenticity of the pretended Letters. For who can imagine that the Writers, who flouriſhed then, and have tranſmitted to us moſt minute Accounts of far leſs important Tranſactions both Civil and Eccleſiaſtical, would have paſſed this over in Silence? In the Second place, *Eudoxia* is ſuppoſed, in all thoſe Letters, to have outlived *Chryſoſtom*; whereas it is certain that ſhe died in 404, four Years before him. Laſtly, In the above-mentioned Letter, *Arcadius* is all along ſuppoſed to have repented and changed his Conduct towards *Chryſoſtom*, to have perſecuted his Enemies as he had formerly done his Friends, and to have chiefly vented his Reſentment on the firſt Author of all the Diſturbances, the Empreſs, who thereupon, out of Grief, Rage, and Deſpair, fell into a dangerous Malady g. But of all this not the leaſt Hint is to be met with in *Palladius*, who wrote in the laſt Days of the Life and Reign of *Arcadius*; nay, that Hiſtorian ſpeaks of the Friends of *Chryſoſtom* as Men ſtill under the Emperor's Diſpleaſure, and feeling the dreadful Effects of it in the inhoſpitable Places, to which they had been formerly confined.

Chryſoſtom *did not appeal to the See of* Rome.

From the Conduct of *Chryſoſtom* on this Occaſion, the *Roman-Catholic* Divines have taken a great deal of Pains to prove, that the Cuſtom of appealing to the See of *Rome* obtained in his Time; that he actually appealed to that See; and conſequently, that the Prerogative of receiving Appeals from all Parts, and finally deciding all Controverſies, claimed by the Biſhops of *Rome*, was then acknowleged even in the Eaſt. Nothing ſurely but the utmoſt Diſtreſs for want of other Inſtances to prove their Aſſertion, could have tempted them to make uſe of this; ſince, from the Conduct of *Chryſoſtom* on this very Occaſion, nay, and from that of *Innocent* too, if ſet in their true Light, it may be undeniably made out, that this pretended Prerogative was utterly unknown to both. The Fact ſtands thus, and thus it is related by the Hiſtorians, who have tranſmitted it to us: *Chryſoſtom*

g Vid. Bar. ubi ſup. Niceph. l. 13. c. 34. & Glyc. l. 4. p. 259, 260.

is

is unjuſtly accuſed; the Biſhop of *Alexandria* takes upon him to inquire into his Conduct; aſſembles a Council, conſiſting chiefly of *Egyptian* Biſhops, and ſummons *Chryſoſtom* to appear before them: *Chryſoſtom* pays no Regard to the Summons, proteſts againſt it, and will not allow the Biſhops aſſembled to have any Power or Authority over him, *ſince it had been ordained by the Canons of the Church, that the Affairs of the Provinces ſhould be regulated by the Biſhops of the Provinces; and it was conſequently very incongruous, that the Biſhops of* Thrace *ſhould be judged by thoſe of* Egypt[k]. No Regard is had to his Proteſt, none to the Canons upon which it was grounded: he is ſummoned anew; and, not appearing within the limited Time, is judged, condemned, and depoſed. From this Sentence he appeals to a lawful Council; but, being, notwithſtanding his Appeal, driven from his See, he recurs at laſt to the Weſtern Biſhops, namely, to *Innocent* of *Rome*, *Venerius* of *Milan*, and *Chromatius* of *Aquileia*, intreating them not to abandon him in his Diſtreſs, nor exclude him from their Communion[l], but to procure by all means the aſſembling of a General Council, in order to reſtore the Church to her former Tranquillity.

Such was the Conduct of *Chryſoſtom*: and, from this Conduct, does it not manifeſtly appear, that *Chryſoſtom* was an utter Stranger to the pretended Power in the Biſhops of *Rome* of receiving Appeals from all other Tribunals, and finally determining all Controverſies? Who can think, that, had he been acquainted with ſuch a Prerogative, he would, when ſo unjuſtly oppreſſed, have appealed to a Council, which, he was well appriſed, would meet with great Obſtructions, when he had, ready at hand, a more certain and eaſy Method of finding Relief? Had he been ſatisfied, that *Innocent* had ſuch a Privilege, is it likely he would have wrote to him on ſo urgent an Occaſion, without taking the leaſt Notice of it; that he would have contented himſelf with only intreating him to procure the aſſembling of a General Council? Should a Biſhop now, apprehending himſelf injured by a National or Provincial Synod, appeal, not to the Pope, but, as *Chryſoſtom* did, to a General Council, he would, by ſuch an Appeal, draw upon himſelf the Indignation of the *Roman* See: for it would be thence concluded, and no Concluſion can be more natural, that he did not acknowlege the Power of receiving *Appeals* claimed by that See.

Chryſoſtom an utter Stranger to the Power of receiving Appeals in the Biſhops of Rome.

[k] Chryſoſ. ep. 122. [l] Pall. dial. 2.

But

Chryſoſtom *never acknowleged ſuch a Power.*

But *Chryſoſtom*, ſay they, did acknowlege ſuch a Power; for, in his Letter to *Innocent*, he intreats him *to declare ſuch wicked Proceedings void and null, and to pronounce all, who had any Share in them, puniſhable, according to the Eccleſiaſtical Laws.* But *Chryſoſtom* addreſſes himſelf here, not to *Innocent* alone, as I have already obſerved, but to him, in Conjunction with *Venerius* of *Milan*, and *Chromatius* of *Aquileia* [m]; nay, he addreſſes himſelf, throughout the whole Letter, to more Perſons than one; and yet *Baronius* has the Aſſurance to ſtile the Letter an *Appeal* to *Innocent* [n]. And why to him, and not to the other Two, ſince he wrote nothing to him but what he wrote to them? *Bellarmine*, finding ſome Expreſſions in the above-mentioned Letter, which he thought might be ſo interpreted as to favour and countenance the Pretenſions of the See of *Rome*, had *Chryſoſtom* addreſſed himſelf to *Innocent* alone, makes him accordingly, by altering the Number in the Paſſage he quotes, addreſs himſelf to *Innocent* alone (A); and thence concludes, that even the *Greeks* acknowleged the Biſhop of *Rome* for their Supreme Judge [o]. What muſt every impartial Man think of a Cauſe, that wants to be thus defended? What of thoſe, who thus defend it?

The Diſingenuity of Bellarmine.

Innocent's *Letter to* Exuperius *Biſhop of* Toulouſe.

About this time, that is in the Year 405. *Innocent*, being conſulted by *Exuperius* (B) Biſhop of *Toulouſe*, concerning ſome Points of Diſcipline, anſwered him by a Decretal, containing the following Deciſions: 1. That the Prieſts and Deacons, who were daily employed in ſacrificing or baptizing, were not to be allowed the Uſe

[m] Idem ibid. [n] Bar. ad ann. 404. n. 20. [o] Bell. Rom. Pontif. l. 2. c. 15.

(A) He changes *obſecro ut ſcribatis* into *obſecro ut ſcribas*.

(B) *Exuperius* was, as we gather from *Auſonius*, a Native of *Bourdeaux*, one of the greateſt Orators of his Time, and had governed *Spain* in Quality of Prefect. He afterwards withdrew from the World, embraced the Eccleſiaſtical State in the Place of his Nativity (1); and was, for his eminent Virtues, raiſed to the See of *Toulouſe*. He was chiefly commendable for his Charity to the Poor; though he beſtowed the greater Part of it on Objects, perhaps, of all, the leaſt worthy of his Compaſſion: for, by the Monk *Siſennius*, he ſent conſiderable Sums into the Eaſt, to be diſtributed there among the Monks of *Egypt* and *Palæſtine* (2); which might have been better employed at home, *Gaul* being then threatened with an Invaſion of the *Vandals*, *Alans*, and other barbarous Nations; who, accordingly, broke into that Province on the laſt Day of the Year 406. and made themſelves Maſters of *Toulouſe* itſelf. It was, however, this Kindneſs of *Exuperius* to the Monks, that chiefly recommended him to *Jerom* (3), who often mentions him with the greateſt Commendations (4), and even inſcribed to him his Comment on *Zechariah*.

(1) Paulin. ep. 20. (2) Hier. præf. in lib. 1, 2, & 3. Zach. & ep. 152.
(3) Idem, ibid. (4) Idem ep. 410, 411.

of

of Matrimony; that thoſe, who were ignorant of the Decretal iſſued by *Syricius*, might be forgiven, upon their promiſing thenceforth to live continent; but, as to the reſt, they ſhould, as unworthy of Indulgence, be depoſed. The Second Article relates to thoſe, who, after Baptiſm, had led a wicked or ſinful Life, and at the Point of Death deſired the Communion. *Innocent* declares, that to ſuch, according to the antient Diſcipline of the Church, which was more ſevere, Repentance was granted, and not the Communion; but, according to the preſent Practice, both were granted. By Repentance is here meant, according to the moſt probable Opinion, a Reconciliation with the Church; and, by the Communion, the Euchariſt, which the Thirteenth Canon of the Council of *Nice* commands to be given to all dying Perſons who deſire it. Some doubted whether it was lawful for a Chriſtian to diſcharge the Office of a Judge, in criminal Caſes. *Innocent* therefore declares, in the Third Article, that no Penance ought to be impoſed upon thoſe who had condemned Criminals to the Rack, or even to Death, the Civil Power having been eſtabliſhed by God for the Puniſhment of Criminals. As Women were, it ſeems, more frequently puniſhed for Adultery than Men, ſome imagined that Crime not to be alike puniſhable in both. This Notion *Innocent* confutes in the Fourth Article; adding, that Women were more frequently puniſhed, merely becauſe the Husbands were more forward in accuſing their Wives, than Wives were in accuſing their Husbands. The Fifth Article is a Confirmation of the Third; for it only abſolves from all Sins ſuch as are obliged, by their Office, to proſecute or condemn Criminals. The Sixth Article excludes from the Communion of the Church all Men, who, after they have been parted from their Wives, marry other Women; and all Women, who, after they have been parted from their Huſbands, marry other Men (A). The ſame Puniſhment is, by this Article,

(A) The matrimonial Bond is held, by the Church of *Rome*, indiſſoluble, and a Separation only allowed as to Bed and Board, even in Caſes of Adultery; whence it follows, that ſo long as they both live, neither can marry, without being guilty of Adultery. There are, however, ſome *annulling Impediments*, as the Canoniſts ſtyle them, that is, Circumſtances rendering the Marriage-contract null; and if any of theſe intervene, and is made to appear, the Parties are then declared not to have been married; and, conſequently, free to marry whom they pleaſe. Till *Innocent*'s Time, Men, who had been parted from their Wives convicted of Adultery, were allowed to marry again. This *Epiphanius* tells us in expreſs Terms; adding, that, agreeably to Scripture (no doubt to *Matt.* v. 32.), it could be no Crime to marry again; that thoſe who married again were not excluded, on that ſcore, from Life everlaſting;

Article, inflicted on thoſe who marry them, but not on their Parents or Relations, provided they have been no way acceſſory to that unlawful Contract. The laſt Article contains a Catalogue of the Canonical Books of Scripture, the ſame as are ſtill acknowleged by the Church of *Rome* as Canonical. In the ſame Article, ſome Books are pointed out, that ought to be abſolutely condemned and rejected P (B). Theſe Directions, or Inſtructions, *Innocent* pretends to have drawn partly from Scripture, and partly from Tradition; and thanks *Exuperius*, becauſe he had, by applying to him for a Solution to his Difficulties, engaged him to examine them with Attention, and thereby given him an Opportunity of learning what he had not known before. It is ſurpriſing he ſhould have mentioned the Scripture, ſince the very Firſt Article, debarring for ever married Men from the Uſe of Matrimony, is an open Contradiction to the Directions given by St. *Paul* to all married Perſons, without Reſtraint or Diſtinction; *Defraud you not one the other, except it be with*

P Conc. t. 2. p. 1254—1256.

and conſequently ought not to be excluded from theCommunion of theChurch (1). The Scope and Deſign of *Epiphanius*, throughout his Work, was to acquaint us with the ſeveral Hereſies that ſprung up in the Church, and to explain, in Oppoſition to them, the Catholic Doctrines. It muſt therefore have been deemed a Hereſy in his Time, that is, towards the latter End of the Fourth Century, to think the matrimonial Bond indiſſoluble, even in Caſes of Adultery, or to hold it unlawful for a Man to marry again, who had put away his Wife *for the Cauſe of Fornication*. But the Hereſy became afterwards a Catholic Truth, and the Catholic Truth a Hereſy. This Change, however, was not ſo much owing to *Innocent*'s Decretal, as to the two Books, which St. *Auſtin* wrote about the Year 419. to prove, that it is unlawful for a Huſband, who has put away his Wife, even for Adultery, or for a Wife who has been thus put away, to marry again, while both are living. He founds his Opinion on that of St. *Paul*, *The Wife is bound by the Law, as long as her Husband liveth* (2). But, inſtead of underſtanding that Paſſage with the Exception made by our Saviour himſelf, *Whoſoever ſhall put away his Wife, ſaving for the Cauſe of Fornication*, &c. he endeavours, by many logical Diſtinctions, and unnatural Interpretations, to remove that Exception, though expreſſed by the Evangeliſt in the plaineſt Terms. He was therein, no doubt, miſled, by the groundleſs, but then reigning, Notion, of an extraordinary Merit annexed to Celibacy; and therefore ends his Work with exhorting the Huſbands, who have put away their Wives, to obſerve Continency, in Imitation of the Eccleſiaſtics, who obſerve it (ſays he) with the greateſt Exactneſs, though it was not by their own Choice that ſome of them went into Orders. It may be queſtioned, whether, even then, the Continence of the unmarried Clergy was ſuch as he repreſents it.

(B) Theſe were ſeveral Books, ſtyled *The Acts of the Apoſtles*, forged by *Leucius*, *Nezocharis*, and *Leonides*, and aſcribed by them to ſome of the Apoſtles. *Leucius* was, by Sect, a *Manichee*, as appears from *Auſtin*, who confuted his Books (3). *Nezocharis* and *Leonides* are, by *Innocent*, ſtyled Philoſophers. The Books of *Leucius*, in the latter End of the preſent Century, were anew declared Apocryphal by Pope *Gelaſius*: *The Books*, ſays he, in one of his Decretals, *compoſed by* Leucius, *a Diſciple of the Devil, are all Apocryphal* (4).

(1) Epiph. hæreſ. 59. (2) 1 Corinth. vii. 39. (3) Aug. de fide contra Manich. (4) Gelaſ. in Decretal. de lib. Apocryph.

Conſent for a time, &c. *and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your Incontinency* [q].

As the Biſhops of *Rome* had, ever ſince the time of *Damaſus*, taken upon them to appoint the Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* their Vicar for *Eaſt-Illyricum*, *Innocent* no ſooner heard, that *Rufus* had been promoted to that See, vacant by the Death of *Anyſius*, than he let all the Biſhops in thoſe Parts know, by a Circular Letter, probably directed to *Rufus* himſelf, that he conferred on him the ſame Dignity which his Predeceſſors had conferred on the other Biſhops of *Theſſalonica*. He wrote, at the ſame time, a private Letter to *Rufus*, containing ſome Inſtructions relating to the Exerciſe of his Vicarious Power, and, with them, the Names of the Provinces which he was to govern, as his Vicar and Firſt Primate; but without intrenching, adds *Innocent*, upon the Rights and Privileges of the Primate or Metropolitan of each Province. In this Letter he takes great care, that *Rufus* ſhould not forget he is indebted for ſuch a Power to the See of *Rome*; for that he frequently repeats, as if he entertained ſome Jealouſy of *Rufus*, or apprehended that he might claim ſuch a Power, as Biſhop of *Theſſnlonica*, that City being, according to the Civil Diviſion of the Empire, on which the Eccleſiaſtical was ingrafted, the Metropolis of *Eaſt-Illyricum* [r].

His Letter to Anyſius *of* Theſſalonica.

The ſame Year 407. the Emperor *Honorius* viſited the City of *Rome*, and continued there till the Month of *May* of the Year 708. On the 23d of the following *Auguſt*, *Stilicho* was killed; and *Alaric* the *Goth*, entering *Italy* ſoon after his Death, appeared before *Rome*, and laid cloſe Siege to that City in the latter End of the ſame Year. As no Proviſions could be conveyed into the Place, all the Avenues being ſhut up and well guarded, a Famine ſoon enſued, and upon the Famine a Plague, which daily ſwept off great Numbers of the Inhabitants. In this Extremity, ſuch of the Senators as ſtill adhered to the Pagan Superſtitions, promiſing themſelves Relief from the Gods of their Anceſtors, reſolved to implore their Protection, by ſolemn Sacrifices offered up to them in the Capitol, and other public Places of the City. This Reſolution, ſays *Zoſimus* [s], they imparted to *Innocent*, then Biſhop of *Rome*, who, ſacrificing his private Opinion to the public Welfare, agreed to it, on Condition that the Ceremony ſhould be privately performed. Of theſe Sacrifices *Sozomen* too

Rome reduced to great Streights by Alaric.

The Pagan Superſtitions connived at by Innocent.

[q] 1 Corinth. vii. 5. [r] Holſten. Coll. Rom. t. 1. p. 49—51. [s] Zoſ. l. 5. c. 40.

takes particular Notice [t]; but makes no Mention of *Innocent*, which has induced ſome to ſuſpect the Veracity of *Zoſimus*, who was, as is well known, a ſworn Enemy to the Chriſtian Religion. But that thoſe Sacrifices were performed, is affirmed both by him and *Sozomen*; and it is not at all probable, that *Pompeianus*, who was then Governor of *Rome*, and a Chriſtian, would have ſuffered them, without the Conſent and Approbation of *Innocent*. However that be, I ſee not why *Baronius* ſhould be ſo provoked againſt *Zoſimus*, for making *Innocent* thus connive at the ſuperſtitious Worſhip of the Gentiles, ſince his Succeſſors have always allowed, and do ſtill allow, even in *Rome* itſelf, the free Exerciſe of the *Jewiſh* Worſhip.

Innocent *leaves* Rome, *and repairs to the Emperor at* Ravenna.

Rome being reduced to the laſt Extremity, Deputies were, in the End, ſent out to treat with *Alaric*, who, hearkening to their Propoſals, raiſed the Siege, upon their paying to him Five thouſand Pounds Weight of Gold, Thirty thouſand of Silver, Four thouſand Silk Garments, Three thouſand Skins of Purple Dye, and as many Pounds of Pepper. At the ſame time the *Romans* engaged to mediate a Peace between him and *Honorius*: but the Emperor refuſing to comply with the Terms that were propoſed, though no ways unreaſonable, the *Roman* Senate ſent Two ſolemn Deputations to *Ravenna*, where *Honorius* then reſided, to lay before him the Danger to which he expoſed the Empire, and perſuade him to accept the Conditions offered him both by them and by *Alaric*. As the Firſt Deputation proved unſucceſsful, *Innocent*, thinking his Preſence might give ſome Weight to the Negotiations, left *Rome*, and, together with the Deputies, repaired to *Ravenna*. Thus he eſcaped the Mortification of ſeeing the City of *Rome* taken and plundered by the Barbarians [u]. For *Honorius* ſtill rejecting the Terms of Peace, *Alaric* returned with his Army before *Rome*; and, having made himſelf Maſter of it on the 24th of *Auguſt* of the Year 410. treated the great Metropolis of the Empire no better, if *Jerom* may be credited, than the *Greeks* are ſaid to have treated antient *Troy* [w].

Innocent's *Letter to* Marcianus, *Biſhop of* Naiſſus.

While *Innocent* continued at *Ravenna*, he wrote to *Marcianus*, Biſhop of *Naiſſus*, a City in *Mœſia*, concerning the Eccleſiaſtics of his Dioceſe, who had been ordained by *Bonoſus*, of whom we have ſpoken above [x]. In that Letter, *Innocent* declares, that *Marcianus*

[t] Soz. l. 9. c. 6. [u] Zoſ. l. 5. p. 819—820. Soz. l. 9. c. 7. [w] Hier. ep. 16.
[x] Vid. ſup. p. 263—266.

ought

ought to admit to his Communion, and even reſtore to their Churches thoſe Eccleſiaſtics, who, having adhered to *Bonoſus*, after his Condemnation, were willing to return, provided they had been ordained by him before his Condemnation. One of theſe, by Name *Ruſticus*, to remove all Doubt concerning the Validity of his Ordination, had cauſed himſelf to be reordained by a Catholic Biſhop; and this Reordination *Innocent* condemns, in the ſame Letter, as highly criminal [y].

His Letter to Aurelius *of* Carthage.

In the Year 412. *Innocent* wrote to *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, whom he ſeems to have greatly honoured and eſteemed, concerning the Day on which *Eaſter* was to be kept in the Year 414. He acquaints *Aurelius*, that the 16th Day of the Moon of *March* would fall that Year on the 22d of the Month, and the 23d of the Moon on the 29th of the Month; and conſequently that, in his Opinion, *Eaſter* ought to be kept on the 22d of *March*. However, he deſires *Aurelius* to diſcuſs that Point in the Council of the *African* Biſhops, that was in a ſhort time to be held at *Carthage*; and to let him know, whether they approved of ſuch a Regulation, or what they objected againſt it, that he might ſolemnly notify by his Letters, according to Cuſtom, the Day, on which *Eaſter* was to be celebrated [z]. Their thus notifying to the other Biſhops the Day on which *Eaſter* was to be kept, was no Argument of Power; but it gave them an Air of Pre-eminence, which they dexterouſly improved into Power.

The Letter of the Biſhops of Macedon *to* Innocent.

In the Year 414. *Vitalis*, Archdeacon probably of *Theſſalonica*, arrived at *Rome*, with Letters for *Innocent*, from the Biſhops of *Macedon*, touching certain Points of Diſcipline, which, it ſeems, they had referred to him, and he had decided before. In this Letter they repreſent to him, in the firſt place, that, according to the Cuſtom and Practice of their Churches, the marrying a Widow was no Bar or Impediment to Orders, or even to the Epiſcopal Dignity; and that to marry one Wife before, and a Second after, Baptiſm, was not, with them, deemed Bigamy. Then paſſing to thoſe, who had been ordained by *Bonoſus*, they declare it as their Opinion, that nothing more could be required than the Bleſſing of a lawful Biſhop to readmit them to the Functions of their Office. They conclude with begging Leave to raiſe to the Epiſcopal Dignity one *Photinus*, who had been condemned by the Predeceſſors of *Innocent*, and to depoſe a Deacon, by Name *Euſtatius* [a].

[y] Conc. t. 2. p. 1271. [z] Conc. t. 2. p. 1264. [a] Conc. t. 2. p. 1272—1276.

This

Innocent's *Answer.*

This Letter *Innocent* answered, almost in the Style and Language of a modern Pope. He begins with expressing his Surprize at the Affront they offered to the Apostolic See, by calling in Doubt what he had already decided. He then answers, one by one, the Heads of their Letter, with all the Authority of an unerring Judge, though neither he, nor any of his Predecessors, had ever yet claimed, or thought of claiming, such a Prerogative. He absolutely condemns the Practice of admitting to Orders such as had married Widows, because that was forbidden, says he, by *Moses* to the High Priest of the *Jews*; which was tacitly declaring the *Levitical* Laws to be still, in some Degree, binding with respect to the Christian Clergy. He adds, that if any such had been ordained, it was the general Practice of all the Churches, both in the East and West, to depose them (A). As for those who had married but one of their Two Wives after Baptism, *Innocent* declares them equally incapable of being ordained as if they had married both (B). As to the Ecclesiastics ordained by *Bonosus*, *Innocent* not only excludes them from the Ministry, but endeavours to prove in general, that Orders, when conferred by Heretics, are null, borrowing, for that Purpose, of St. *Cyprian*, all the Arguments which that Father had made use of to prove a no less erroneous Opinion; *viz.* the Nullity of Baptism, when conferred by Heretics (C).

Innocent *declares Orders conferred by Heretics to be null.*

Which Opinion has been since declared heretical.

The Opinion, which he endeavours to establish here, has been since condemned as heretical, by several of his Successors, and is now held as such by the whole Church; which has cut out a great deal of Work for the Champions of Infallibility. They plainly see (and who can read *Innocent*'s Letter without seeing?), that the Reasons which

(A) Such a Practice, however general, could have no other Foundation but the same unwarrantable Notion: I say, unwarrantable; for what can be more so than to exclude, as *Innocent* does, even from the lowest Degrees in the Church, a Man who had married a Widow, because the High Priest of the *Jews* was not allowed to marry one, though all other Priests were, under that Law, free from such a Restraint?

(B) *Jerom* held the contrary Opinion, and maintained it in one of his Letters (1), with Reasons, that appeared to *Baronius* *almost unanswerable* (2), that is, no otherwise answerable than by the *Ipse dixit* of *Innocent*, which, with him, stood in the room of Reason.

(C) He was, it seems, no Logician; else, to prove his Opinion, he had never made use of Arguments, that equally proved, and had been calculated to prove, an erroneous Opinion, an Opinion long before condemned by all the Bishops of the Catholic Church, and very lately by himself, in a Letter to *Alexander* Bishop of *Antioch*, where he maintains the Validity of Baptism conferred by an *Arian* (3).

(1) Hier. ep. 83. (2) Bar. ad ann. 405. n. 60. (3) Inn. ep. 18.

he

he made uſe of were all calculated to prove the Nullity of Ordination by the Hands of an Heretic; but nevertheleſs pretend, that whatever their ſeeming Purport may be, *Innocent* employed them only to prove, that an heretical Biſhop had not the Power of conferring Grace, and with it the Right of exerciſing lawfully the Functions of his Office [b]. But who can believe any Man, endowed with the leaſt Share of common Senſe, capable of arguing ſo abſurdly? If his Meaning may be thus wreſted, in ſpite of his Words, to a Catholic Senſe, whoſe Meaning may not?

With reſpect to *Photinus*, *Innocent* declares himſelf very unwilling to blame, or give Occaſion to the World to think that he blamed, the Conduct of his Predeceſſors, who had condemned *Photinus*; but nevertheleſs, ſince ſo many Prelates had made it appear by their joint Teſtimonies, that the Holy See had been impoſed upon by falſe and groundleſs Reports, he agrees to his Promotion. As to the Deacon *Euſtatius*, he lets them know, that whatever Reports may have been ſpread to his Prejudice, he is well aſſured both of his Probity, and the Purity of his Faith, and therefore cannot conſent to his Depoſition. In the End of his Letter, he complains of the Biſhops of *Macedon* for not paying due Regard to the Teſtimony of the *Roman* Church, in behalf of the Two Subdeacons *Dizonianus* and *Cyriacus*.

Innocent owns the holy See to have been impoſed upon.

We have obſerved above, that *Chryſoſtom* being driven from the See of *Conſtantinople* into Exile, *Innocent*, and with him moſt of the Weſtern Biſhops, had eſpouſed his Cauſe with great Warmth; but, finding that all their Endeavours in his Behalf proved unſucceſsful, they at laſt ſeparated themſelves from the Communion of *Atticus* of *Conſtantinople*, *Porphyrius* of *Antioch*, and *Theophylus* of *Alexandria*. In the Year 407. *Chryſoſtom* died at *Cumana* in *Pontus*; but with him did not die the Animoſities, which his Depoſition had occaſioned between the Churches of the Eaſt and the Weſt. *Atticus* indeed thought nothing could now obſtruct the wiſhed-for Union; and therefore, as ſoon as *Chryſoſtom*'s Death was known, he applied to *Rome*, deſiring the Communion of that Church. But he was greatly ſurpriſed, when he underſtood, that *Innocent*, inſtead of readily granting him his Requeſt, inſiſted upon his firſt acknowleging *Chryſoſtom* to have been, and to have died, lawful Biſhop of *Con-*

The Miſunderſtanding between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches continues after the Death of Chryſoſtom.

[b] Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 10.

ſtantinople,

ſtantinople, by inrolling his Name in the Diptychs (A), with the Names of other Biſhops of that City. This Demand ſeemed to *Atticus* highly unreaſonable; for it was obliging him to acknowlege his own Election to have been null. He therefore peremptorily refuſed to comply with it; but nevertheleſs continued ſoliciting, by means of his Friends at *Rome*, a Reconciliation with that Church [c]. But *Innocent* was inflexible; he was determined at all Events to carry his Point, and therefore would hearken to no other Terms till that was complied with. The Eaſtern Biſhops followed the Example of *Atticus*; the Weſtern that of *Innocent*. And thus were the Separation, and the Animoſities attending it, continued Seven Years longer, each Party bitterly inveighing, in the mean time, againſt the Authors of the Diviſion, and each expreſſing a moſt earneſt Deſire of a Reconciliation.

The Churches of Antioch *and* Rome *reconciled.*

At length *Porphyrius* of *Antioch*, one of *Chryſoſtom*'s moſt inveterate Enemies, dying in the Year 413. or 414. *Alexander*, who till then had led a monaſtic Life, was choſen in his room by the unanimous Conſent of the People and Clergy. As he was fully convinced of *Chryſoſtom*'s Innocence, and the Malice of his Enemies, he no ſooner found himſelf veſted with that Dignity, than he cauſed the deceaſed Prelate's Name to be inſerted in the Diptychs of his Church, and the Two Biſhops *Helpidius* and *Pappus* to be reſtored to their Sees, from which they had been driven for refuſing to renounce his Communion, and to communicate with his Enemies. After this *Alexander* ſent a ſolemn Deputation to *Rome*, at the Head of which was, it ſeems, the famous *Caſſian*, to acquaint *Innocent* with his Promotion, to inform him of what he had done, and thereupon to renew the Union between the Two Churches. *Alexander*, who entertained a ſincere Deſire of ſeeing Peace and Concord reſtored between the Eaſt and the Weſt, did not doubt but the Example of his Church would be followed by many others, and a Way, by that Means, be paved to a general Pacification. *Innocent* received the Deputation with the greateſt Marks of Joy, admitted *Alexander* to his Communion, and, with the Conſent and Approbation of Twenty-

[c] Theodoret. l. 5. c. 34.

(A) The Diptychs were Tables, in which were inrolled the Names of all thoſe who died in the Communion of the Church. The Biſhops were placed there by themſelves; and of all Commemoration was made by the Deacon in the Time of the Service.

four

Four other Biſhops, declared the Church of *Antioch* again united to that of *Rome*.

Several other Biſhops, moved partly by the Example, and partly by the Letters and Exhortations of the Biſhop of *Antioch*, yielded to *Innocent*, and ſubmitted to the Terms he required. But *Atticus* ſtill adhered to his former Reſolution, and, to gain him, *Alexander*, who ſpared no Pains to complete the Work he had begun, repaired in Perſon to *Conſtantinople*. But he acted there with ſuch Indiſcretion as rendered that haughty Prelate more averſe, than he had ever yet been, to an Accommodation on the Terms propoſed by *Innocent*. For all other Means he could think of, to compaſs his Deſign, proving unſucceſsful, he reſolved in the End to apply to the Populace, who, as he well knew, had been moſt zealouſly attached to *Chryſoſtom* during his Life, and revered him as a Saint after his Death. Suffering therefore his Zeal to get the better of his Prudence, and of every Conſideration Prudence could ſuggeſt, he began to harangue the Multitude, and inflame them with ſeditious Speeches againſt *Atticus*, as carrying, even beyond the Grave, his Hatred and Malice againſt their holy Biſhop. The Populace heard him with Attention, applauded his Zeal, and, full of Rage againſt *Atticus*, demanded, in a tumultuous manner, that the Name of ſo holy, ſo great and deſerving a Prelate, might be inrolled, without further Delay, in the Diptychs. But their Clamours and Threats made no more Impreſſion on the Mind of *Atticus* than the Reaſons of *Alexander*; he withſtood both; and the Biſhop of *Antioch*, finding all his Attempts thus ſhamefully baffled, returned to his See, with the Mortification of having only widened the Breach, which he intended to cloſe, between the Churches of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople* [d]. *Baronius* ſuppoſes *Alexander* to have acted on this Occaſion as *Innocent's* Legate [e]. But I find nothing in the Antients to countenance ſuch a Suppoſition, beſides his haughty Behaviour, and his purſuing, by the moſt unwarrantable Methods, what he had in View.

The Biſhop of Antioch *ſtrives to reconcile the Churches of* Rome *and* Conſtantinople.

His Imprudent Conduct.

Atticus, however, allowed, in the End, *Chryſoſtom's* Name to be inſerted in the Diptychs; but whether he did it by Choice or Compulſion, is uncertain; for, in one of his Letters, he writes, that he could no longer withſtand the Threats and Violence of the enraged Multitude [f]; and, in another, that he had done it to comply with

The Name of Chryſoſtom *inrolled in the Diptychs by the Biſhop of* Conſtantinople.

[d] Niceph. l. 14. c. 27. [e] Bar. ad ann. 48. n. 32. [f] Niceph. c. 26.

the Will of the Emperors, and to conform to the Sentiments of his Brethren, both in the Eaſt and the Weſt g. However that be, it is certain, that he never changed his Sentiments with reſpect to *Chryſoſtom*, as is manifeſt from his declaring, after he had placed his Name in the Diptychs, that he thereby meant no more than to own, that he had been once Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*; but that he ſtill adhered to the Judgment that was given againſt him. With this, however, *Innocent* was ſatisfied; and ſo is *Baronius*.

The Two Churches re-united at laſt.

Alexander maintained ever after a cloſe Correſpondence with *Innocent*, courting his Favour with the moſt ſervile Submiſſions, recurring to him in every momentous Affair relating to his Church, and ſuffering himſelf to be blindly guided by his Counſels. In one of his Letters he conſulted him, it ſeems, concerning the Prerogatives of his See, and the Extent of his Juriſdiction; and nothing can be more ſubtile than *Innocent*'s Anſwer. For after a long Preamble on the Dignity of the See of *Antioch*, he craftily inſinuates all the Privileges and Prerogatives annexed to it to be owing not to the Dignity of the City, but to the Dignity of the See, as having been once the See of St. *Peter*. He adds, that on this Conſideration it had been diſtinguiſhed with an extenſive Juriſdiction, and that it yielded to that of *Rome* itſelf only becauſe St. *Peter* had accompliſhed there what he had begun at *Antioch* h. What *Innocent* propoſed to himſelf by thus exalting the See of *Antioch*, by deriving the Privileges, Prerogatives, and Juriſdiction, of that See from St. *Peter*, is obvious. If they were owing not to the City, but to St. *Peter*, as *Innocent* affirms, thoſe enjoyed by the See of *Rome* were, in like-manner, owing to St. *Peter*, and not to the City. This Notion, now firſt ſtarted by *Innocent*, was not ſuffered to drop; but, being greedily embraced by his Succeſſors, it was, in Proceſs of Time, improved by them into a general Plea for all their exorbitant Claims. And thus *Innocent* may be juſtly ſaid to have pointed out the Ground on which the unwieldy Fabric of the Papal Power was afterwards built. But if it be true, as *Innocent* pretends, that the See of *Antioch* owed its Dignity to St. *Peter*, and not to the City, how will he account for its being ranked under that of *Alexandria*, which was neither founded, nor had ever been honoured, by that Apoſtle? But, not to waſte Time in combating ſuch a groundleſs Notion, nothing is more certain than that the Diſpoſition and Diviſion

Innocent's *Letter to* Alexander *of* Antioch.

The Prerogatives of the See of Rome *owing to the City, and not to St.* Peter.

g Idem, c. 27. h Conc. t. 2. p. 1269.

of the Church was founded upon, and intirely agreeable to, the Diſpoſition and Diviſion of the Empire [i]; and conſequently that as no Regard was had to St. *Peter*, or any other Apoſtle, in the Civil, none could be had in the Eccleſiaſtical, Polity. And hence it naturally follows, that as *Rome* was the Firſt City of the Empire, *Alexandria* the Second, and *Antioch* the Third, the Sees ſhould be ranked in the ſame Order; and in the ſame Order they were ranked accordingly, though the See of *Alexandria* was founded only by a Diſciple of St. *Peter*, and that of *Antioch* was ſuppoſed to have been founded by St. *Peter* himſelf.

The Diviſion of the Church founded on the Diviſion of the Empire.

This Diviſion of the Church took place ſoon after the Diviſion of the Empire made by *Conſtantine the Great*, on which it was founded. It was firſt introduced by Cuſtom, but afterwards confirmed by ſeveral Councils, eſpecially by the General Council of *Chalcedon*, where it was decreed by the Twenty-eighth Canon, *That Biſhops ſhould have Precedence according to the Dignity of the Cities as ſettled by the ſecular Conſtitutions of the Empire.* Not a Word here of St. *Peter*. As therefore the Biſhop of *Alexandria* preceded in Rank the Biſhop of *Antioch*, for no other Reaſon but becauſe the City of *Alexandria* preceded in Dignity the City of *Antioch*, according to the ſecular Conſtitutions of the Empire; ſo the Biſhop of *Rome* preceded in Rank all other Biſhops, for no other Reaſon but becauſe the City of *Rome*, as the Seat of the Empire, preceded in Dignity all other Cities.

Innocent encourages the Biſhop of Antioch *to invade the Rights of the Metropolitans.*

But to return to *Innocent*: In the ſame Letter to *Alexander* he obſerves, that the Biſhop of *Antioch* did not preſide over a ſingle Province, but a whole Dioceſe; and therefore adviſes him not only to maintain the Right he had of ordaining the Metropolitans, but not to ſuffer other Biſhops in the Provinces under his Juriſdiction, however diſtant, to be ordained without his Conſent and Approbation. He adds, that, with reſpect to the Biſhops of the leſs remote Provinces, he might reſerve to himſelf the Right of ordaining them [k]. This was encouraging the Biſhop of *Antioch* to invade and uſurp the undoubted Rights of the Metropolitans, in open Defiance of the Fourth and Sixth Canons of the Council of *Nice*, which were afterwards confirmed by almoſt innumerable other Councils, all granting to the Metropolitans the Power of ordaining the Biſhops of their reſpective Provinces jointly with the Biſhops of the ſame Province, without ever once mentioning the Patriarch or Head of the Dioceſe [l]. But of this Right the Biſhops

[i] See above, p. 105, & ſeq. [k] Concil. t. 2. p. 1269. [l] Vid. Ell. Du Pin. de antiq. eccleſ. diſciplin. diſſert. prim. n. 12.

of *Rome* had deprived the Metropolitans under their Juriſdiction as early at leaſt as the Time of *Syricius*; for that Pope, in the Letter which he wrote to *Anyſius* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, appointing him his Vicar for *Eaſt-Illyricum*, charges him not to ſuffer any Biſhops to be ordained in thoſe Provinces without his Conſent and Approbation. *Innocent* maintained what his Predeceſſors had uſurped; and to countenance their Uſurpation and his own, he encourages, by this Letter, the Biſhop of *Antioch* to purſue the ſame Conduct with reſpect to the Metropolitans of his Dioceſe. The Example of the Biſhops of *Rome* was, in Proceſs of Time, followed by thoſe of *Conſtantinople*, who, rivaling them in Pride and Ambition, not only uſurped the Power of ordaining all the Biſhops of their Dioceſe, but, by the Intereſt they had at Court, obtained an Imperial Reſcript, confirming to them the Power which they had uſurped. But they were ſoon obliged to part with it, though thus guaranty'd, by the Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon* declaring, in the Twenty-fifth Canon of their laſt Seſſion, that the Metropolitans might ordain, and had a Right to ordain, the Biſhops in their reſpective Provinces, without the Conſent and Approbation of the Patriarch. But the Biſhops of *Rome*, ever determined to part with no Power, however acquired, found means not only to elude the Decrees of this and ſeveral other Councils, aſcertaining the Rights of the Metropolitans in the plaineſt Terms, but to improve, by daily Incroachments, their uſurped Juriſdiction, as I ſhall have frequent Occaſion to obſerve in the Sequel of this Hiſtory.

Innocent's *Letter occaſions great Diſputes between the Biſhops of* Antioch *and thoſe of* Cyprus.

Innocent complains, in the next Article of his Letter, of a Cuſtom that obtained in the Iſland of *Cyprus*. It was one of the chief Privileges of the Patriarch, or Biſhop, who preſided over a whole Dioceſe, to ordain the Metropolitans of the Provinces compriſed under his Dioceſe. But the Metropolitan of *Cyprus* was ordained by the Biſhops of that Iſland withont the Conſent, or even the Privity, of the Biſhop of *Antioch*, though *Cyprus* belonged to his Province, according to the Civil Diviſion of the Empire. This Cuſtom *Innocent* condemns, as repugnant to the Canons of the Council of *Nice*; adding, that it was firſt introduced in the unhappy Times when *Arianiſm* prevailed all over *Syria*, the Biſhops of *Cyprus* refuſing then to acknowlege thoſe of *Antioch*, who were infected with that Hereſy. This Article proved the Source of endleſs Diſputes between the Biſhops of *Antioch* and thoſe of *Cyprus*; the former pretending, that the Power of ordaining the Metropolitan of *Cyprus* was lodged in them, and the latter oppo-

ſing

fing with great Warmth ſuch a Pretenſion. The Controverſy was at length referred to the Council of *Epheſus*; and the Fathers of that numerous Aſſembly, having heard and examined with great Attention the Pleas of both Parties, condemned in the ſtrongeſt Terms the Pretenſion of the Biſhops of *Antioch*, as repugnant to the antient Canons, that is, to thoſe very Canons, on which, at the Suggeſtion of *Innocent*, they had founded it. And here I cannot help obſerving, by the way, that the Biſhops of *Antioch* never thought of alleging, in ſupport of their Claim, the Authority of *Innocent*, which they would certainly have done, had they not been well appriſed, that no Regard would have been paid to it by the Fathers of the Council. As for what *Innocent* adds concerning the Time and Manner in which the Cuſtom he complains of was introduced, he muſt certainly have been no leſs miſtaken in thoſe Particulars, than he was in the Senſe and Meaning of the Canons of *Nice*. For who can imagine, that the *Arian* Biſhops, at the Time *Arianiſm* prevailed, that is, when they had the greateſt Intereſt at Court, and the Orthodox had none, would have ſuffered the Biſhops of *Cyprus* to withdraw themſelves, contrary to the eſtabliſhed Laws of the Church, from their Juriſdiction, and withdraw themſelves, Juriſdiction, for no other Reaſon, but becauſe the Biſhops of *Antioch* profeſſed the Doctrine of *Arius?*

Which are in the End decided in favour of the latter.

Alexander, in his Letter to *Innocent*, had asked him, Whether Two Metropolitan Sees ſhould be erected in one Province, which had been divided by the Emperors into Two? *Innocent* replies, That the Concerns of the Church being different from thoſe of the State, the Church ought to adhere to the antient Rule. However, it is plain from Hiſtory, that ſuch Alterations in the State were, generally ſpeaking, attended with the like Alterations in the Church; inſomuch that when the Biſhop of any conſiderable City wanted to be raiſed to the Dignity of a Metropolitan, the moſt expeditious Way of gratifying his Ambition was, to apply to the Emperor for a Diviſion of the Province; that his City being advanced, by ſuch a Diviſion, to the Rank of a Metropolis, he might, by the ſame Means, be preferred to that of a Metropolitan. Of mere Biſhops, thus raiſed to the Dignity of Metropolitans, without any Regard to *Innocent*'s Letter, or, as it is ſtyled, Decretal, ſeveral Inſtances occur in Hiſtory.

Alterations in the State generally attended with the like Alterations in the Church.

Innocent, in the End of his Letter, declares it as his Opinion, that ſuch Eccleſiaſtics as had renounced *Arianiſm*, or any other Hereſy, with

Eccleſiaſtics ordained by Heretics to be admitted into the Church only as Laymen.

with a Deſire of being received into the Church, ought not to be admitted as Eccleſiaſtics, but only as Laymen. This Doctrine is intirely agreeable to the erroneous Doctrine concerning the Invalidity of Ordination by the Hands of an Heretic, which we have heard him labouring to eſtabliſh in his Letter to the Biſhops of *Macedon* [l]. He concludes this Letter with intreating the Biſhop of *Antioch* to cauſe it to be read in a Council, or to ſee that Copies of it be tranſmitted to all the Biſhops of his Dioceſe, that all may agree in obſerving the Inſtructions which it contains [m].

Innocent's *Letter to the Biſhop of* Eugubium.

But of all *Innocent*'s Letters, that which he wrote to *Decentius* Biſhop of *Eugubium* (a City ſtill known by the ſame Name in the Duchy of *Urbino*) is by far the moſt worthy of Notice, whether we conſider the Doctrine which he there lays down, or the Principles on which he founds it. As to the Doctrine, it may be reduced to the Two following Heads; *viz.* That all the Churches in the Weſt are bound to adopt, and ſtrictly to obſerve every Practice and Cuſtom obſerved by the *Roman* Church; and that the Cuſtoms of all other Churches, differing from thoſe of the *Roman* Church, are but Corruptions of the antient Tradition, Deviations from the Practice of the Primitive Times, and inſufferable Abuſes. As for the Principles on which he founds this Doctrine, they are, to ſay no more, of a-piece with the Doctrine itſelf. For he pretends, 1. That no Apoſtle, beſides St. *Peter*, ever preached in the Weſt. He ought, with St. *Peter*, to have at leaſt excepted St. *Paul*, and, no doubt, would, had not his Memory failed him, as well as his Infallibility. He ſuppoſes, in the Second place, That all the Churches in the Weſt were founded by St. *Peter*, or by ſome of his Succeſſors; and conſequently, that they ought to conform to the Cuſtoms of the *Roman* Church, ſince to that Church they owe their Origin. But that the Church of *Lyons*, not to mention others, was founded by Preachers ſent thither out of *Aſia* by St. *Polycarp*, and not by St. *Peter*, or any of his Succeſſors, is affirmed by all the Antients, and allowed by the moſt learned among the Moderns; though ſome of them pretend, without the leaſt Foundation, the Whole to have been done by the Authority of the Biſhop of *Rome* [n]. *Innocent* pretends, in the Third place, every Point of Diſcipline and Eccleſiaſtical Polity to have been ſettled by the Apoſtles, and whatever was ſettled at *Rome* by St. *Peter* to have been there ſtrictly obſerved ever ſince his

All Churches ought, according to him, to conform to the Cuſtoms of the Roman *Church.*

[l] Vide ſupra, p. 310. [m] Concil. t. 2. p. 1265—1269. [n] Vide Petr. de Marc. diſſert. de primat. p. 227.

Time,

Time, without the leaſt Addition or Diminution. He concludes this Part of his Letter with laying it down as a general Maxim, That it is unlawful for any Biſhop to make the leaſt Alteration in the Diſcipline of his Church, or even to introduce into one Church a Cuſtom or Practice obſerved by another [o]. This nevertheleſs is what all Biſhops have done, and even thoſe of *Rome*, both before and after *Innocent*'s Time, and conſequently what they thought it lawful to do. The Pſalmody, for Inſtance (and innumerable other Inſtances might be alleged), or the ſinging of Pſalms in the Churches, was not inſtituted by any of the Apoſtles, but firſt introduced by St. *Ignatius* into the Church of *Antioch* [p], whence it ſpread in a very ſhort time to all the Churches in the Eaſt, thoſe Biſhops no more ſcrupling to adopt, than *Ignatius* had ſcrupled to introduce, ſo laudable a Practice. Of the Eaſtern Churches it was borrowed by the Church of *Milan*, and of the Church of *Milan* by that of *Rome*, long before *Innocent*'s Time; which plainly ſhews, that his Predeceſſors held not that Doctrine, no more than one of the beſt of his Succeſſors, St. *Gregory the Great*, who openly approves of ſome Cuſtoms, that were firſt unknown to, but afterwards adopted by, his Church [q]. Upon the Whole, it is evident, that *Innocent* was groſly miſtaken, not only with reſpect to this Point, but likewiſe in aſſerting, that whatever had been ſettled at *Rome* by St. *Peter*, was ſtill obſerved there without the leaſt *Addition or Diminution*.

Some Cuſtoms of the Roman *Church borrowed of other Churches.*

The remaining part of *Innocent*'s Letter relates to ſome particular Ceremonies and Cuſtoms, eſpecially to the Ceremony of confirming thoſe who were baptized, and the Cuſtom of faſting on *Saturdays*. With reſpect to the former, he informs *Decentius*, that, according to the Cuſtom of the Church, founded on the Practice of the Apoſtles, the Biſhop alone can anoint on the Forehead thoſe who have been baptized, and give them the Holy Ghoſt; and that the Prieſts can only anoint other Parts, the Epiſcopal Power not having been granted to them, though they partake of the Prieſthood (A).

The Ceremony of anointing thoſe who are confirmed.

The

[o] Concil. t. 1. p. 1245. Ugh. t. 1. p. 676. l. 7. ep. 64.

[p] Socrat. l. 6. c. 8.

[q] Greg.

(A) The Ceremony of anointing with Oil the Forehead, and likewiſe the Organs of the Five Senſes, in thoſe who had been baptized, is undoubtedly very antient. *Tertullian*, who lived in the Latter-end of the Second Century, ſpeaks of it as a Ceremony univerſally practiſed and eſtabliſhed (1). St. *Cyprian* (2), who flouriſhed Fifty Years

(1) Tert. de reſur. carnis.

(2) Cypr. ep. 72, 73.

after,

Confirmation *not a Sacrament.*

The *Roman Catholics*, finding this Ceremony, now known by the Name of *Confirmation*, ſtyled a *Sacrament* by St. *Cyprian* [r], and St. *Auſtin* [s], have thereupon raiſed it to that Rank, not reflecting that the antient Writers make frequently uſe of that Word to expreſs no more than a *ſacred Ceremony*, or Myſtery. And truly were they to reckon among their *Sacraments* all the Ceremonies which the Fathers and other Chriſtian Writers have diſtinguiſhed with that Title, their Number would amount to Seventy rather than to Seven.

Why deemed formerly unlawful to faſt on Sunday *or* Saturday.

With reſpect to the other Point, thoſe who are ever ſo little verſed in the Writings of the Fathers, muſt know, that, from the earlieſt Times, it was deemed unlawful, nay, and highly criminal, for a

[r] Cypr. ep. 72. [s] Aug. de diver. ſerm. 33.

after, St. *Ambroſe* (3), St. *Auſtin* (4), St. *Jerom* (5), and the other Fathers, deſcribe it as a Ceremony, by which the Holy Ghoſt was given to thoſe who had been baptized, and conſequently which none but Biſhops could adminiſter, they being the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, to whom alone that Power was granted. For the Fathers, generally ſpeaking, and other antient Writers, ſuppoſe this, and the Impoſition of Hands, by which the Holy Ghoſt was given by the Apoſtles to thoſe who were baptized (6), to be one and the ſame Ceremony. The Oil employed on this Occaſion was, as early as the Third Century, ſolemnly conſecrated, kept in the Churches or Places where the Faithful met, and held by them in great Veneration (7). This gave Riſe, in the following Century, to many ſuperſtitious Practices, and Miracles were ſaid to have been wrought by the *holy Oil*, to warrant ſuch Practices, and confound thoſe who thought it unlawful to comply with them. A very remarkable Miracle of this Nature is gravely related by *Optatus Milevitanus* (8), who wrote about the middle of the Fourth Century. But, in the Time of the Apoſtles, the Whole of this Ceremony conſiſted in the Impoſition of Hands: *Then laid they their Hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghoſt.* Not a Word of *Oil*, of *Chriſm*, of *Unction*, of *ſigning with Oil on the Forehead* in the Form of a *Croſs*, and much leſs of a *Blow* given by the Biſhop on the Cheek to the Perſon that is confirmed, though theſe are now all deemed, in the Church of *Rome*, eſſential Parts of this Ceremony. As ſuch Rites were unknown to, and unpractiſed by, the Apoſtles, it matters little how early they were introduced after their Time. And here I cannot help obſerving, that the *Roman Catholics* themſelves have not thought fit to adopt all the Ceremonies uſed on this Occaſion, and recommended by the Fathers. For, in *Innocent*'s Time, the Perſon confirmed was not only anointed on the Forehead, but on other Parts; on the Forehead by the Biſhop, on other Parts by the Prieſts. The other Parts were, as we gather from *Cyril* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* (9), the Eyes, Ears, Noſe, Mouth, Hands and Feet. The anointing of theſe Parts was, in the Opinion of that Father, no leſs fraught with Myſteries than the anointing of the Forehead: and yet the former Unction, notwithſtanding its Antiquity, and all the Myſteries it ſymbolized, has been long ſince omitted, as altogether unneceſſary. They might in like manner have omitted all the reſt, and contented themſelves, as the Apoſtles did, with the bare Impoſition of Hands.

(3) Ambr. de ſacram. l. 3. c. 2. (4) Aug. contra Petil. l. 1. c. 104. de baptiſ. l. 3. c. 16. In ep. 1. Joan. tract. 3. & de diver. ſer. 33. (5) Hier. contra Luciferian. (6) Act. viii. 15—17. (7) Cyp. ep. 70. & de oper. card. & unct. Chriſ. (8) Optat. Milev. contra Parm. l. 2. (9) Cyril. Catech. myſtag. 3.

Chriſtian

Chriſtian to faſt on *Sunday* or *Saturday*; on *Sunday*, becauſe thoſe Heretics, who denied the Reſurrection of our Saviour, faſted on that Day, in Oppoſition to the Orthodox, who, believing it, ſolemnized the *Sunday*, the Day on which it happened, with Feaſting and Rejoicings; on *Saturday*, becauſe other Heretics holding the God of the *Jews*, and the Author of their Law, to be an evil Spirit, whom Chriſt came to deſtroy, faſted on the Seventh Day, thinking that by faſting they vilified the God of the *Jews* as much as the *Jews* honoured him by feaſting [t]. On this Head St. *Ignatius*, who had converſed with the Apoſtles, expreſſes himſelf in the ſtrongeſt Terms: *If any one*, ſays he, *faſts on* Sundays *or* Saturdays, *he thereby becomes guilty of the Death of Chriſt* (*Chriſti interfector eſt* [u]). Among the antient Canons, known by the Name of the *Apoſtolic Conſtitutions*, we read the following Ordinance: *If a Clerk ſhall be found to have faſted on a* Sunday *or a* Saturday, *let him be depoſed; if a Layman, let him be cut off from the Communion of the Faithful* [x]. But *Ignatius*, and the other *Greek* Fathers, who after his Time condemned that Practice of faſting on *Saturdays*, muſt be underſtood only with reſpect to the Eaſt; for there was broached, and there chiefly prevailed, the Hereſy that firſt introduced ſuch a Practice. But in the Weſt, where that Hereſy was ſcarce known, ſome Churches, and the *Roman* in particular, obſerved both *Fridays* and *Saturdays* as Faſt-days. The *Friday* was, from the earlieſt Times, a Faſt-day with all Churches, both in the Eaſt and the Weſt; the *Saturday* was only in the Weſt, and even there with very few Churches, which had borrowed that Cuſtom of the *Roman* Church, as we are informed by St. *Auſtin* [y]. *Innocent* therefore, deſirous of eſtabliſhing in all other Churches the Cuſtom that obtained in his own, undertakes to prove, firſt, That all may, and, ſecondly, That all ought to obſerve *Saturday* as a Faſt. That all may, he proves well enough; but the Reaſons he offers to ſhew that they all ought, *viz. Becauſe Chriſt lay in the Sepulchre the* Saturday *as well as the* Friday, *and the Apoſtles faſted*, as he ſuppoſes, *on both Days*, are manifeſtly unconcluſive as to any Obligation. Beſides, it was not becauſe Chriſt lay in the Sepulchre, or becauſe the Apoſtles faſted, but becauſe Chriſt was crucified on a *Friday*, that a Faſt was appointed to be obſerved on that Day. In Proceſs of Time, the Cuſtom of ſanctifying both Days with a Faſt took place in moſt

Friday *from the earlieſt Times a Faſt-day.*

Saturday *a Faſt-day in the* Roman *Church.*

[t] Vide Iren. l. 1. c. 21—24. & Epiph. hæreſ. 21—28. & 41, 42. [u] Ign. ep. 8. ad Philippenſes. [x] Apoſt. conſt. can. 55. [y] Aug. ep. 86.

of the Weſtern Churches; and this Cuſtom has been made in latter times a general Law, and one of the Commandments of the Church which all *Roman Catholics* are bound to obey on pain of Damnation. However, the Severity of it is ſo far relaxed, that, as they are only required to abſtain from Meat, the utmoſt Riot and Epicuriſm in other Kinds of Food, and in Wine, may be, and are indulged on their Faſt-days.

The Ceremony of anointing the Sick with Oil.

The laſt Article of *Innocent*'s Letter relates to the Ceremony of anointing the Sick with Oil, agreeably to that of St. *James*, *Is any ſick among you*, &c. [y]? As the Apoſtle directs the Faithful to *call for the Elders of the Church*; ſome took from thence Occaſion to queſtion whether Biſhops were impowered to perform that Ceremony. *Innocent* therefore anſwers *Decentius*, who had propoſed the Queſtion, that there can be no room to doubt whether or no the Biſhops have ſuch a Power, ſince the Prieſts can have none, which the Biſhops have not, of whom they receive all their Power. It is true, ſays *Innocent*, that St. *James* ordered the Faithful to call for the Elders, and not for the Biſhops; but that was becauſe he knew that the Biſhops could not have ſo much Leiſure from other important Duties as the Prieſts. He adds, that this Unction muſt not be applied to Penitents; that the Oil uſed in it muſt be bleſſed by the Biſhop; and when it is thus bleſſed, not the Presbyters only, but all the Faithful, may anoint with it both themſelves and others. The Power of anointing, St. *James* confined to the Elders or Prieſts, and that is the preſent Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, though *Innocent* extended ſuch a Power to all the Faithful. This Ceremony, now known by the Name of *Extreme Unction*, was, in *Innocent*'s Time, *a kind of Sacrament*; for ſo he ſtyles it [z]. But it is now a true *Sacrament*, and ſuch it was declared by the Council of *Trent* [a].

Letters from the Councils of Carthage *and* Milevum *to* Innocent.

In the Year 416. *Innocent* received Three Letters from the *African* Biſhops; *viz.* one from the Biſhops of *Africa*, properly ſo called, aſſembled at *Carthage*; another from thoſe of *Numidia*, aſſembled at *Milevum*; and a Third from St. *Auſtin*, ſigned by him and Four other Biſhops. The Two Councils wrote to acquaint *Innocent*, that they had condemned *Pelagius* and his Diſciple *Celeſtius*, of whoſe Opinions I ſhall ſpeak hereafter, and deſire him to add the Authority of the Apoſtolic See to their Decrees. The Letter from St. *Auſtin*, and the

[y] James v. 14, 15. [z] Concil. t. 2. p. 1248. [a] Conc. Trid. ſeſſ. 14. can. 1.

Four

Four other Biſhops, was to inform *Innocent*, in a friendly manner, that he was ſuſpected of countenancing thoſe Heretics, and favouring their Doctrine. This Suſpicion they themſelves ſeem not to have thought quite groundleſs: for *Poſſidius*, one of the Biſhops who ſubſcribed the Letter, writes, that the *African* Biſhops took a great deal of Pains to convince *Innocent*, and his Succeſſor *Zoſimus*, that the Doctrine of *Pelagius* was erroneous and heretical, knowing that his Followers were ſtriving to infect the Apoſtolic See itſelf with their poiſonous Tenets [b]. They ſtrove in vain, ſays *Baronius*; and perhaps they did; but the *African* Biſhops had never taken ſo much Pains to guard the Apoſtolic See againſt that Infection, had they not thought it capable of being infected. The Five Biſhops ſent to *Innocent*, together with their Letter, St. *Auſtin*'s Anſwer to a Letter which he had received from *Pelagius*; his Confutation of a Book compoſed by that Heretic and the Book itſelf, with the Paſſages marked in it that gave moſt Offence, and claimed a particular Attention, leſt he ſhould overlook them [c]. This was not treating him as an infallible Judge (A).

Innocent's *Anſwer to the Councils.*

The Letters from the Council of *Carthage*, from that of *Milevum*, and from the Five Biſhops, were brought to *Rome* by *Julius*, Biſhop of ſome City in *Africa*; and, by the ſame *Julius*, *Innocent* anſwered them with Three Letters, all dated the 27th of *January* of the Year 417. The Firſt, which is addreſſed to *Aurelius*, probably Biſhop of *Carthage*, and to the other Biſhops of that Aſſembly, he begins with commending them for their Zeal, their Paſtoral Vigilance, and the Regard they had ſhewn for the *Apoſtolic See*. He thence takes an Opportunity to reſume his uſual and favourite Subject, the Dignity, Pre-eminence, and Authority of that See; roundly aſſerting, that *all Eccleſiaſtical Matters throughout the World are, by Divine Right, to be referred to the Apoſtolic See, before they are finally decided in the Provinces.* This

He claims the firſt a Divine Right of finally deciding all Controverſies.

[b] Poſſid. Aug. vit. c. 18. [c] Aug. ep. 95.

(A) *Baronius* obſerves here, that their informing him by a private Letter, and not by a public one from the Council, of the Suſpicions that ſome entertained of him, was a Mark of the great Reſpect and Veneration they had for the Biſhop of *Rome*, whoſe Nakedneſs they were unwilling, as it became dutiful Children, to expoſe to the Eyes of the World (1). And who told *Baronius*, that, in the like Circumſtances, they would not have ſhewn the ſame Reſpect for any other Biſhop? He had better have obſerved, and the Obſervation is more obvious, that his being ſuſpected at all evidently proves the *Infallibility* of the Apoſtolic See not to have been, in thoſe Days, an Article of the Catholic Faith.

(1) Bar. ad ann. 416. n. 11.

was indeed a very bold Claim, and a direct asserting to himself the Universal Supremacy attained by his Successors. But it was yet too early for such a Claim to be granted; and it is plain the *African* Bishops had no Idea of this Divine Right. For, had they entertained any such Notion, they surely would never have presumed finally to condemn and anathematize, as they did, *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*, without consulting at least the Apostolic See: neither would they have wrote to *Innocent* in the Style they did, after they had condemned them: for, in their Letter, they do not leave him at Liberty to approve or disapprove of what they had done; but only desire him to join his Authority to theirs, which they well knew he could not refuse to do, without confirming the Suspicion of his countenancing the *Pelagians*, and their Doctrine. *We have anathematized* Pelagius *and Cælestius*, say the Fathers of the Council of *Carthage*, *and thought fit to acquaint you with it, that to the Decrees of our Mediocrity might be added the Authority of the Apostolic See.* This is a modest Style, and respectful to the See of *Rome*; but it is that of Men who plainly thought they had a Right to act in this Matter, by their own Judgment and Power, without waiting for the Award of that See, as they ought to have done, if they had allowed of *Innocent*'s Claim. In like manner the Council of *Milevum*, after informing *Innocent* of the Sentence, which they had pronounced against the Two abovementioned Heretics, adds: *And this Error and Impiety, which has every-where so many Followers and Abetters, ought also to be anathematized and condemned by the Apostolic See* [h]; which was putting *Innocent* in mind of what he ought to do, and not consulting him what they should do. This Conduct of the *African* Bishops gave *Innocent* no small Uneasiness. He was at a Loss what to do at so critical a Juncture. For to approve of a Conduct, so derogatory to the pretended Dignity of his See, was giving up his Claim to the *Divine Right* of finally deciding all Ecclesiastical Controversies. To disapprove it, was confirming the Suspicion of his countenancing the Doctrine which they had condemned. But *Innocent* was a Man of great Subtlety and Address; and he found out, at last, an Expedient to extricate himself out of that Perplexity, and gratify the Fathers of both Councils, without either approving or condemning their past Conduct. The only thing they required of him was to join his

Which is not acknowleged by the African *nor the* Numidian *Bishops.*

An Instance of Innocent's *great Subtlety and Address.*

[h] Aug. ep. 90—95.

Authority

Authority with theirs, in condemning the *Pelagian* Hereſy; and that he readily did. But, leſt in ſo doing, he ſhould ſeem to approve of their having condemned it without firſt conſulting him, in his Anſwer to their Letters, he ſuppoſes them to have actually conſulted him; nay, to have referred to him the final Deciſion of that Controverſy; and, agreeably to that Suppoſition, he commends them for the Deference they had thereby ſhewn to the Apoſtolic See. *You have well obſerved*, ſays he, *the Ordinances of the antient Fathers, and not trampled under-foot what they, not in human Wiſdom, but by Divine Order, have eſtabliſhed*; viz. *That whatever is done in Places, however remote, ſhould, for a final Concluſion, be referred to the Apoſtolic See.* And again, *You have had due Regard to the Honour of the Apoſtolic See, I mean of him who has the Charge and Care of all Churches, in conſulting him in theſe Perplexities, and intricate Caſes* [i]. Thus did *Innocent* maintain his Claim, and, at the ſame time, avoid quarreling, at an improper Seaſon, with thoſe who had acted in direct Oppoſition to it. A neceſſary Policy in the firſt ſetting up of ſuch extravagant and groundleſs Pretenſions.

He excommunicates Cæleſtius *and* Pelagius

In the preſent Letter he not only approves of the Judgment given againſt *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius* by the *African* Biſhops, but alleges ſeveral Reaſons in Confutation of the Doctrines they taught; and concludes, by declaring them cut off from the Communion of the Church, agreeably to the Sentence of the *African* Biſhops, as Men not only unworthy of that Communion, but of human Society, and even of Life [k]. The ſame things he repeats in his Anſwer to the Biſhops of *Numidia*; but he ſeems there to have been ſenſible, upon a more cool Conſideration, that, in his Letter to the Council of *Carthage*, he had ſtrained his Prerogative too high; and therefore in this he confines to Matters of *Faith* the general Maxim, which he had laid down, concerning the Obligation of referring all Eccleſiaſtical Matters, for a final Deciſion, to the Apoſtolic See. In the ſame Letter he endeavours to confute, in particular, the Doctrine of *Pelagius*, allowing Children, who die without Baptiſm, to partake of eternal Life [l]. In his Anſwer to the Five Biſhops, he refers them for his real Sentiments, concerning the Doctrine of *Pelagius*, to the other Two Letters, adding, that he had read the Book of *Pelagius*, which they

[i] Idem ib. [k] Aug. ep. 93. [l] Idem ep. 91, 93.

had

had ſent him, and found nothing in it that he liked, or rather that he did not diſlike [m] (A).

Cæleſtius *condemned by the* African *Biſhops, notwithſtanding his Appeal to* Rome.

Cæleſtius had been condemned by a Council held at *Carthage* in the Year 412. and probably conſiſting of the ſame Biſhops who compoſed that of the Year 416. From their Sentence he appealed, as *Baronius* obſerves [n], to the See of *Rome*, ſummoning his Accuſer *Paulinus* to appear at the ſame Tribunal. But all we can infer from thence is, that either *Innocent* did not receive the Appeal, or, if he did, that the *African* Biſhops made no Account of it, ſince they condemned him anew, without waiting for the Judgment of *Innocent*, to whom he had appealed.

Innocent's *Letter to* Jerom.

Innocent wrote Two Letters more, a little before his Death, one of which was to St. *Jerom*, comforting him in his Diſtreſs. For ſome, who favoured *Pelagius*, provoked at *Jerom*'s repeated Invectives againſt him, had ſet Fire to his Monaſtery at *Bethlehem*, and burnt it down to the Ground, agreeably to the Spirit and Methods in which religious Controverſies were now carried on. Their Deſign was to have burnt *Jerom* himſelf; but he had the good Luck to eſcape out of the Flames, and ſave himſelf in a ſtrong Tower. The Two noble Virgins, *Euſtochium* and her Niece *Paula*, who led a retired Life under the Direction of *Jerom*, met with no better Treatment. For thoſe Fanatics, breaking into the Houſe where they lived, beat ſome of their Attendants in their Preſence, killed others, and threatened them with Fire and Deſtruction. With this they acquainted *Innocent*, who thereupon wrote to *Jerom*, offering to exert *the whole Authority of the Apoſtolic See* againſt the Authors of ſuch Exceſſes, provided he knew who they were: for the Two Virgins had concealed their Names, probably to prevent his exerting that Authority, which they had Reaſon to apprehend would be attended with greater Evils.

[m] Idem ep. 96. [n] Bar. ad ann. 412. n. 25.

(A) That the *Pelagian* Hereſy was firſt condemned by the *African* Biſhops, is a Fact ſo well atteſted, that one would think it impoſſible it ſhould ever have come into any Man's Thoughts to call it in queſtion. And yet *Baronius*, upon the Authority of a very doubtful Paſſage out of St. *Proſper*, a cotemporary Writer, roundly aſſerts that Hereſy to have been firſt condemned, not by the *African* Biſhops, but by *Innocent* (1). The Words of *Proſper* are: — *Peſtem ſubeuntem prima recidit ſedes Roma Petri* (2). Theſe Words are variouſly interpreted by the Learned, but all agree in rejecting the Interpretation of *Baronius*, as making (3) *Proſper* contradict a known Truth.

(1) Bar. ad ann. 412. n. 26. (2) Proſp. de Ingratis, l. 1. c. 2. (3) Vide Janſenium de Hær. Pelag. p. 16. Merc. t. 1. p. 9.

Inno-

Innocent adds, that ſo long as the Authors and Promoters of thoſe unheard of Barbarities are unknown, he can only condole with thoſe who have ſuffered by them; but, if they were accuſed in due Form, at his Tribunal, he would not fail to appoint proper Judges to try them; which, by the way, he had no Right to do.

His Letter to John *of* Jeruſalem.

Innocent's other Letter is to *John* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, who hated *Jerom*, on Account of his Inveteracy againſt *Origen*, and was ſuſpected to connive at the cruel Treatment he and his Followers had met with. Him therefore *Innocent* reprimands very ſeverely, for ſuffering ſuch enormous Abuſes within the Limits of his Juriſdiction. In his Letter he gives him the Title of *well-beloved Brother*; but, at the ſame time, treats him with more Haughtineſs than was becoming even in a Superior, though he neither had, nor could claim by the Canons, any kind of Juriſdiction or Authority over him.

Innocent *dies.*

Theſe Letters *Innocent* wrote in the Latter-end of *January*, and died on the 12th of *March* of the ſame Year 417. having governed the *Roman* Church near Fifteen Years; for his Predeceſſor *Anaſtaſius* died on the 27th of *April* 402. and he was choſen ſoon after his Deceaſe, as I have obſerved above. He was generally eſteemed a Man of good Parts, and well acquainted with the Laws and Traditions of the Church. Hence he was frequently conſulted by the Weſtern, and ſometimes by the Eaſtern Biſhops, in Points both of Faith and Diſcipline. Of this general Eſteem, and the Deference that was thereupon paid to his Deciſions, he took Advantage to lay down, with an Air of Authority, and as undoubted Truths, many falſe, groundleſs, and dangerous Maxims, all tending to the Diminution of the Epiſcopal Power, and the Advancement of the Papal. *The Dignity of the Apoſtolic See* was, as we have ſeen, the Burden of almoſt all his Letters; he even improved it into a Claim of Supremacy; and we may ſay, with great Truth, that to him the See of *Rome* was more indebted for the Grandeur it afterwards gained, than to all his Predeceſſors together. He formed the Plan of that Spiritual Monarchy, which they, by conſtant Application, eſtabliſhed at laſt, in ſpite of the many almoſt inſurmountable Difficulties, which they had to contend with. He was the firſt who, changing the antient Foundation of the Primacy, claimed it as the Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, *the Prince of the Apoſtles*, as he is ſtyled, and not as the Biſhop of the firſt City, though on that Conſideration alone it had been granted by

The See of Rome *greatly indebted to him for its Grandeur.*

the Councils. I ſaid *Primacy*, becauſe the Word *Supremacy* was utterly unknown in thoſe Days. The Council of *Sardica*, held in the Year 347. had allowed, in ſome Caſes, and under ſeveral Reſtrictions, Appeals to be made to the See of *Rome*, as has been obſerved elſewhere [t]. But *Innocent*, ſcorning to owe any Branch of his Authority to that, or any other Council, claimed, by *Divine Right*, the Power of finally deciding all Eccleſiaſtical Controverſies and Diſputes; which was claiming, by Divine Right, an unlimited Juriſdiction. It is true, no Regard was had to ſuch Claims; nor indeed did *Innocent* dare to purſue them, being well appriſed of the Oppoſition he would meet with, if he ſhould then have made ſuch an Attempt. He therefore wiſely contented himſelf with laying Foundations, and thought it a great Advance, as it certainly was, to have openly aſſerted ſuch Notions, and brought the Ears of Men to endure them, if not their Minds. Had he gone farther, he would have been ſtopped in his Career, and it might have proved fatal to the Power of *Rome* before it was come to an Age of Maturity; but that he went thus far was of great Benefit to it, becauſe it made a Beginning, and furniſhed his Succeſſors with a Pretence to plead ſome Antiquity for the Opinions and Principles upon which they proceeded.

His Decretals often quoted by the Popiſh Divines.

Accordingly the Decretals of *Innocent* are frequently quoted by the Advocates for the See of *Rome*, to ſhew how early the Popes claimed, by Divine Right, and as Succeſſors of St. *Peter*, an univerſal Authority and Juriſdiction. But if the Principles, on which they founded their Claims, were falſe in *Innocent*'s Time, they are ſtill ſo in ours; if no Account was then made of ſuch Claims (and that none was made, I have ſufficiently ſhewn), no Account ought to be made of them now; no more than if they were dated but Yeſterday. Nor, indeed, ought the Beginning of the Fifth Century to be eſteemed an early Time in the Chriſtian Church. Great Corruptions were then crept into it; and, with regard to the Point in Queſtion, it was very late. For had the Biſhop of *Rome* been ſupreme Head of the Church, in Right of St. *Peter*, how came that Supremacy to be unknown, and unheard of, for above Four hundred Years? If the Four firſt Centuries could not diſcover it, on what new Light was it revealed to the Fifth?

Is ſainted.

Innocent has been inrolled, by his Succeſſors, in the Catalogue of Saints; and he is now adored in the Church of *Rome* as a Saint of the

[t] Vide p. 121.

firſt

firſt Rate; an Honour which, it muſt be confeſſed, he better deſerved at their Hands, in their Eſtimation of Merit, than any of his Predeceſſors, or any of his Succeſſors, except *Gregory* the VIIth.

HONORIUS. # ZOSIMUS, THEODOSIUS *the younger.*

Fortieth BISHOP *of* Rome.

ZOSIMUS, the Succeſſor of *Innocent*, was, according to the *Bibliothecarian*, a *Greek* by Nation, and the Son of one *Abraham* [a]; which is all we know of him before his Election. He was elected and ordained Six Days after the Death of his Predeceſſor, that is, on the 18th of *March* 417 (A). Year of Chriſt 417.

The firſt thing that engaged the Attention of *Zoſimus*, after his Election, was the Hereſy of *Pelagius*, and his chief Diſciple *Cæleſtius*, which, at that time, made a great Noiſe in the Church. *Pelagius* was by Birth a *Briton*, and a Monk by Profeſſion; but one of thoſe who, parting with their Eſtates, and renouncing all worldly Honours, lived an auſtere Life; but in no Community, and under no Rule. Such a Monk was the famous *Paulinus*, ſuch *Pammachius*, and ſuch probably *Pelagius*; for I do not find, in any antient Writer, that he ever confined himſelf to a Monaſtery; nay, the wandering Life he led is a ſtrong Proof he never did (B). As to his Parts, *Jerom*, who could never diſcover any thing commendable in thoſe he oppoſed, Pelagius *his Country, Profeſſion, Parts, &c.*

[a] Anaſ. c. 42.

(A) *Paſcaſinus*, Biſhop of *Lilybæum*, obſerves, at the Year 443. that in 417. when *Zoſimus* was Biſhop of *Rome*, *Eaſter*, which ought to have been kept on the 22d of *April*, was, by a Miſtake, kept on the 25th of *March* (1); ſo that on the 25th of *March*, *Zoſimus* was in Poſſeſſion of the See; and conſequently muſt have been choſen and ordained on the 18th of that Month, the only *Sunday* in 417. between the 12th of *March*, when *Innocent* died, and the 25th. For in thoſe Days Biſhops were commonly ordained on *Sundays*, and it is very certain, that *Zoſimus* was ordained on that Day, ſince he pretended the Ordination of Two Biſhops, whom he depoſed, to be null, becauſe they had been ordained on another Day (2).

Theodoret makes *Boniface* the immediate Succeſſor of *Innocent* (3). But all the other Writers, without Exception, place *Zoſimus* between *Innocent* and *Boniface*.

(B) He is commonly ſtyled *Pelagius the Briton*, to diſtinguiſh him from *Pelagius* of *Tarento*, who lived about the ſame time (4).

(1) Leo, t. 1. p. 413. (2) Conc. t. 2. p. 1569. (3) Theod. l. 5. p. 751.
(4) Aug. ep. 106. Proſp. contra Ingrat. l. 1. c. 1.

speaks of him with the greatest Contempt, as if he had no Genius, and but very little Knowlege [c]. But St. *Austin*, a more candid and less passionate Writer, owns him to have been a Man of extraordinary good Sense, of a very sprightly Genius, of great Penetration, and one who was not easily overcome, but rather capable of maintaining, with the strongest Reasons that could be offered, the Opinions which he once embraced [d]. He lived several Years at *Rome*, at least from the Year 400. to 411. and was there well known, and greatly esteemed. For St. *Austin*, who first heard of him, while he lived at *Rome*, spoke of him in the first Books, which he wrote against him, as of a Man, *who passed for a Saint, who had made great Progress in Piety, whose Life was chaste, and Manners blameless, who had sold and given to the Poor all he had*, &c. [e] St. *Paulinus* and St. *Jerom* seem to have once entertained a no less favourable Opinion of him in these respects, than St. *Austin* did; for they too, in some of their Letters, speak of him with the greatest Commendations. But he no sooner began to broach his new Doctrines than he forfeited their good Opinion, and with it every Virtue which he had formerly possessed; nay, they pretend that he abandoned himself, at once, to immoderate Eating and Drinking, and to all manner of Debauchery, passing his whole Time in Revels and Banquets, in caressing and pampering his Body, which by that means, says *Jerom*, swelled to such an exorbitant Size, that he was more capable of crushing his Adversaries with the Weight of his Carcase than the Weight of his Arguments [f]. We shall find very few, if any at all, who, upon their teaching Doctrines not approved by the Fathers, have not been immediately transformed by them, out of their great Zeal for the Purity of the Faith, into Monsters of Wickedness, though they themselves had, perhaps, proposed them before for Patterns of every Christian Virtue. It behoves us therefore to be very cautious in giving Credit to what they say of those whom they style Heretics. With respect to *Pelagius*, St. *Austin*, more moderate than the rest, does not charge him with any Vices, but only ascribes to Hypocrisy the Virtues which he had admired in him before [g].

Cælestius *his Family, Profession, Parts*, &c.

Cælestius, the first and chief Disciple of *Pelagius*, was, according to some, a Native of *Scotland* or *Ireland*; according to others, of

[c] Jans. Hist. Pel. p. 2. Orig. c. 8—21, &c. [d] Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. [e] Aug. ep. 95. Pecc. [f] Hier. in Jer. [g] Vide Jan. hist. Pel. l. 6. c. 24.

Campania in *Italy* [h]; but, with respect to his Country, nothing certain can be advanced. He was descended of an illustrious Family, and had applied himself, from his Youth, to the Study of the Law, and made some Figure at the Bar; but, growing weary of that Profession, he retired from the World, embraced a monastic Life, and lived some Years in a Monastery [i]. St. *Jerom* speaks of him as a Man of no Genius or Talents [k]. But St. *Austin* entertained a very different Opinion of his Parts; for he commends him as a good Writer, as one who was thoroughly acquainted with all the Subtilties of Logic, and whose Talents would have proved very serviceable, could he have been retrieved from his Errors [l].

Their Doctrine.

The Tenets of *Pelagius* or *Cælestius* (for those, who embraced them, are styled indifferently *Pelagians* and *Cælestians)* may be reduced to the following Heads: 1. That we may, by our Freewill, without the Help of Grace, do Good, and avoid Evil. 2. That if Grace were necessary for either, God would be unjust in giving it to one, and denying it to another. 3. That Faith, which is the first Step to our Justification, depends upon our Freewill. 4. That the Sin of *Adam* hurt none but him; that Children are born in the State which he was in before the Fall; that they are not delivered by Baptism from eternal Perdition, but, without Baptism, partake of Life everlasting. By Life everlasting they meant, a middle State between eternal Happiness and eternal Misery. 5. That Grace is only necessary to render the Observance of the Commandments more easy.

Both pass over into Africa.

These Opinions *Pelagius* and *Cælestius* first broached at *Rome*, about the Year 405. and gained there a great many Followers; more, says St. *Austin*, than could be well imagined [m]. They both left *Rome* in 410. or 411. and, crossing over into *Africa*, infected many there, says the same Author, especially at *Carthage*, with their new Doctrine [n]. *Pelagius*, after a short Stay at *Carthage*, went first into *Egypt*, and from thence into *Palæstine*, where he continued a long time [o]. *Cælestius* remained at *Carthage*, hoping to be preferred there to the Priesthood; but as he did not use the due Caution in propagating his Doctrine in that City, he was soon discovered, and ac-

Pelagius *repairs to* Palæstine.

[h] Hier. in Jer. et Garnerius in Mar. Mercat. [i] Gennad. de script. eccles. c. 44. [k] Hier. ad Ctesiph. c. 3. [l] Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. [m] Aug. ep. 89. [n] Aug. de Gest. Pelag. c. 22. [o] Aug. ibid.

Cæleſtius *accuſed and condemned in* Africa.

cuſed by one *Paulinus*, a Deacon, before a Council, at which ſeveral Biſhops were preſent, and *Aurelius* of *Carthage* preſided. The Charge brought againſt him was, That he held the Sin of *Adam* to have hurt him alone; that it could not be imputed to his Deſcendents; and, that no Sin was cancelled by Baptiſm. Theſe Tenets he did not own before the Council; but neither would he diſown or anathematize them: and therefore the Biſhops, provoked at his Obſtinacy, not only condemned his Doctrine, but, at the ſame time, cut him off, as an incorrigible Heretic, from the Communion of the Church [o]. From this Sentence *Cæleſtius* appealed to the Judgment of *Innocent*, then Biſhop of *Rome*, ſummoning *Paulinus*, his Accuſer, to make his Charge good at that Tribunal. But *Cæleſtius* himſelf laid, it ſeems, no Streſs on his Appeal; for, inſtead of repairing to *Rome*, he fled to *Epheſus* [p], where we ſhall leave him for the preſent.

Appeals to Rome, *but flies to* Epheſus.

Pelagius *accuſed in* Palæſtine *by* Heros *and* Lazarus, *two* Gallican *Biſhops*;

Pelagius, in the mean time, was not idle in *Palæſtine*, whither he had retired, as I have ſaid above; but, being countenanced by *John* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, he gained daily ſuch Numbers of Followers there, that *Heros* and *Lazarus*, Two Biſhops of *Gaul*, whom I ſhall ſpeak of hereafter, happening to be then in *Palæſtine*, thought it incumbent upon them to accuſe him to *Eulogius* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, and Metropolitan of *Palæſtine*. They drew up a Writting accordingly, containing the chief Heads of the Doctrine which *Pelagius* taught, together with the Articles, for which his Diſciple *Cæleſtius* had been condemned by the Council of *Carthage*; and this Writing they preſented to *Eulogius*. Hereupon a Council was aſſembled ſoon after at *Dioſpolis*, a City of *Palæſtine*, known in Scripture by the Name of *Lydda*. It conſiſted of Fourteen Biſhops, and *Eulogius* of *Cæſarea* preſided; but neither of the *Gallican* Biſhops was preſent, the one being prevented by a dangerous Malady, and the other not chuſing to abandon him in that Condition. However, their Charge againſt *Pelagius* was read, and he examined, by the Fathers of the Aſſembly, on the Articles it contained. But as nobody appeared againſt him, as none of thoſe Biſhops were ſufficiently acquainted with the *Latin* Tongue to underſtand his Books, and he diſowned ſome Propoſitions, explained others in a Catholic Senſe, and anathematized all who maintained Doctrines repugnant to thoſe of the

and abſolved by the Council of Dioſpolis.

[o] Aug. ep. 89. Mar. Mer. comm. c. 1. Mar. Mer. comm. c. 1. Oroſ. apol. p. 801.

[p] Aug. ib. et de Geſt. Pel. c. 11.

Catholic

Catholic Church, the Council pronounced, at the Suggeſtion of *John* of *Jeruſalem*, the following Sentence: *Since the Monk* Pelagius, *here preſent, has ſatisfied us, as to his Doctrine, and anathematized, with us, whatever is contrary to the true Faith, we acknowlege him to be in the Communion of the Church* [q]. This Council St. *Jerom* ſtyles, *The Pitiful Synod of* Dioſpolis [r]. But St. *Auſtin*, inſtead of inſulting them, calls them *Holy and Catholic Judges*; and will not anſwer, that he himſelf might not have been deceived by the Artifices of *Pelagius*, had he been one of his Judges [s].

He is accuſed by Heros *and* Lazarus *to the Biſhops of* Africa.

Heros and *Lazarus*, ſurpriſed to hear that the Fathers of the Aſſembly had abſolved *Pelagius*, and deſpairing of ever being able to get him condemned in the Eaſt, where his Cauſe was openly eſpouſed by the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, reſolved to apply to their Brethren in the Weſt, eſpecially to the Biſhops of *Africa*, who they well knew could not be prejudiced in his Favour, ſince they had already condemned his favourite Diſciple *Cæleſtius*. Purſuant to this Reſolution, they wrote, by the famous *Oroſius*, who was returning from *Palæſtine* to *Africa*, to the Biſhops of that Province, accuſing *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius* as the Authors of an *Execrable Sect*; giving them a particular Account of what had paſſed in the Council of *Dioſpolis*, and acquainting them with the wonderful Progreſs the new Hereſy made in the Eaſt, eſpecially in *Palæſtine* [t].

The Doctrine of Pelagius *and* Cæleſtius *condemned anew in* Africa.

Theſe Letters were delivered by *Oroſius* to the Biſhops of the Province of *Carthage*, who, after having cauſed them to be read in the Provincial Council, which was then ſitting in that City, and, with them, the Acts of the Council, which had been held Five Years before againſt *Cæleſtius*, not only condemned the Doctrine aſcribed to him and *Pelagius*, but declared, that the ſame Sentence ſhould be pronounced againſt them, unleſs they anathematized, in the plaineſt and moſt diſtinct Terms, the Errors with which they were charged [u]. The Example of the Biſhops of *Africa* was followed by thoſe of *Numidia*, aſſembled at *Milevum*, and by *Innocent* Biſhop of *Rome*, as I have related above.

They appeal to Rome.

This Condemnation, ſo ſolemn and general, was attended with the wiſhed-for Effect. It greatly leſſened the Reputation of *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius*, ſtaggered many of their Followers, and deterred others

[q] Aug. Geſt. Pel. c. 6, 11, 20, 29, 30, 35. ep. 96, 106. Hier. ep. 79. [r] Hier. ibid. [s] Aug. Geſt. Pel. c. 1. Vide Noris hiſt. Pel. l. 2. c. 8. [t] Aug. ep. 90. [u] Idem ibid. et ep. 95.

from

from embracing their Doctrines. Of this both *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius* were well appriſed; and, at the ſame time, ſenſible, that the only means of retrieving their Credit, and maintaining the Ground they had gained, was to juſtify themſelves either to the Biſhops of *Africa*, or to the Biſhop of *Rome*, they choſe the latter, thinking it more eaſy to gain over one than many. Beſides, in *Africa* they knew St. *Auſtin*, who was in great Reputation there, and ſwayed all the Councils as he pleaſed, to be their declared and irreconcileable Enemy; whereas they had many Friends at *Rome*; and, among the reſt, the Presbyter *Sixtus*, who was afterwards raiſed to that See [w]. In order, therefore, to perſuade the Biſhop of *Rome*, as *Pelagius* had done the Biſhops of *Dioſpolis*, that they had been falſly and maliciouſly accuſed, *Pelagius* wrote a Letter to *Innocent*, whoſe Death he had not yet heard of, while *Cæleſtius*, truſting to his Eloquence, and depending on the Favour which the Biſhops of *Rome* had always ſhewn to thoſe who recurred to them, undertook a Journey to that City. He had fled from *Carthage* to *Epheſus*, as I have related above. On his Arrival in that City he was well received by the Biſhop of the Place, and even preferred, after he had ſtaid ſome time there, to the Prieſthood. But, in the mean time, his Doctrine giving Offence to ſome, while it was embraced by others, great Diſturbances aroſe; and he was, in the End, driven out of the City. Being thus expelled from *Epheſus*, he repaired to *Conſtantinople*; but he no ſooner began to diſcover his Sentiments there, than *Atticus*, who then held that See, and kept a watchful Eye over him, commanded him forthwith to depart the City [x]. From *Conſtantinople* he went ſtrait to *Rome*; and, finding that *Innocent* was dead, he preſented himſelf before his Succeſſor *Zoſimus*, declaring, that he was come to *Rome*, to defend his oppreſſed Innocence at the Tribunal of the Apoſtolic See; not doubting but he ſhould make it appear before ſo knowing and unprejudiced a Judge, and confute the many groundleſs Aſperſions with which his Enemies had ſtrove to blaſt his Reputation in the Eyes of the whole Church: he complained of the Judgment given againſt him by the *African* Biſhops about Six Years before; and, pretending that his Accuſer *Paulinus*, conſcious of his Innocence, and his own Guilt, had declined the Judgment of the Apoſtolic See, he ſummoned him anew to appear, and make good the Charge which

Cæleſtius *is driven from* Epheſus *and* Conſtantinople.

Repairs to Rome, *and preſents himſelf before* Zoſimus.

[w] Aug. Pecc. Orig. c. 8. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. ep. 104, 105. Proſp. in collat.
[x] Aug. ep. 90, 92. Hier. in Jer. Mercator com. c. 1.

he

he had brought againſt him. At the ſame time he preſented to *Zoſimus* a Requeſt, containing a Confeſſion of his Faith, with long Deſcants on the Articles of the Apoſtolic Symbol, concerning which his Orthodoxy had never been queſtioned. But as to *Grace* and *Original Sin*, he ſaid, they were not Matter of Faith; but that he was, nevertheleſs, ready to acquieſce, even with reſpect to them, to the Judgment of the Roman See [y].

He delivers his Confeſſion of Faith to Zoſimus;

Zoſimus had at this Time ſome Affairs of the greateſt Importance on his Hands [z]; but, highly pleaſed with the pretended Submiſſion of *Cæleſtius*, and thinking this a favourable Opportunity of extending his Authority, and drawing to the Tribunal of the Apoſtolic See Appeals in Cauſes that had been judged and decided elſewhere, he poſtponed the other Affairs to attend to this alone, in his Opinion, the moſt important of all. A Day was appointed, without Loſs of Time, for *Cæleſtius* to appear in the Church of St. *Clement*, and there give an Account of his Faith. He appeared accordingly; and the Confeſſion being read, which he had delivered to *Zoſimus*, he owned that, and no other, to be his Faith. In that Confeſſion he did not deny Original Sin, but declared, in the cleareſt Terms, that he was in Doubt about it; and that the Belief of Original Sin was no Article of the Catholic Faith. And yet ſuch a Confeſſion was approved by *Zoſimus* as Catholic; which was approving, if not the Doctrine, at leaſt the Doubts which *Cæleſtius* entertained of Original Sin [a]. The *Roman Catholic* Divines have taken great Pains to clear *Zoſimus* from this Imputation; but have been attended with no better Succeſs than St. *Auſtin* was before them. For that Father, unwilling to condemn one of his Brethren, pretended that *Zoſimus*, in approving the Confeſſion of *Cæleſtius*, did not declare his Doctrine to be Catholic, but only the Diſpoſition of his Mind to condemn whatever ſhould be found amiſs in his Doctrine; for ſuch a Diſpoſition, ſays he, makes a true Catholic [b]: he might have added, *if ſincere, and not feigned*; for it was certainly feigned in *Cæleſtius*; and conſequently *Zoſimus* was no leſs miſtaken in declaring his Diſpoſition of Mind to be Catholic, than if he had made ſuch a Declaration with reſpect to his Doctrine. St. *Auſtin* himſelf was ſenſible of the Weakneſs of his Plea, and therefore immediately added; *But, allowing the Doctrine of* Pelagius *and* Cæleſtius *to have been approved by the* Roman *Church*,

which is approved by him.

The Roman Catholic *Divines ſtrive in vain to excuſe* Zoſimus.

[y] Aug. Gr. Ch. c. 30, 33. Peccat. Orig. c. 23.
[a] Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. & Pecc. Orig. c. 6.
[z] Vide Bar. ad ann. 417.
[b] Idem ad Bon. ibid.

all

all we can infer from thence is, that the Roman *Clergy was guilty of Prevarication*[c]; an Inference which he seems to be no-way solicitous about, though he could not have admitted it without giving up the Question, if he had thought the Pope infallible.

His haughty Letter to the African *Bishops in favour of* Cælestius.

Zosimus, however prejudiced in favour of *Cælestius*, did not take upon him to restore him to the Communion of the Church, from which he had been cut off by the Bishops of *Africa* Six Years before, or to come to any farther Resolution till he had imparted the Affair to them. He wrote accordingly to *Aurelius* of *Carthage*, and to the other *African* Bishops; not that he stood in need of their Advice, or wanted to be directed by them, as he let them know in his Letter, but because he was willling to hear what they had to object against one who had been first accused at their Tribunal. He upbraids those Prelates, and with great Bitterness and Acrimony, as if they had acted with too much Haste and Precipitation in an Affair that required the most mature Deliberation. As for *Heros* and *Lazarus*, the two great Opposers of *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*, he inveighs against them with the most abusive Language that an implacable Rage could suggest. He lets the *African* Bishops know, that if the Accusers of *Cælestius* did not appear at *Rome* in Two Months, to make good their Charge against him, he would declare him innocent, and admit him as a true Catholic to his Communion. He styles all such Inquiries, that is, Inquiries concerning *Grace* and *Original Sin*, empty Speculations, and trifling Disputes, owing to a criminal Curiosity, and an immoderate Desire of speaking and writing; in which perhaps he was not much to blame: he closes his Letter with exhorting them not to trust to their own Judgment, but to adhere in every thing to the Scripture and Tradition[d].

The Characters of Heros, Lazarus, *and* Patroclus.

As for *Heros* and *Lazarus*, against whom *Zosimus* chiefly vented his Spleen, while he favoured *Cælestius*; St. *Prosper* gives us, in his Chronicle, the following Account of the former: "*Heros*, says he, "was Bishop of *Arles*, a holy Man, and the Disciple of St. *Martin*. "However, he was driven from his See by his own People, though "quite innocent, and not even accused of any Fault. In his room "was placed one *Proculus*, an intimate Friend of Count *Constantius*, "who at that Time bore a great Sway in the Empire, and whose Fa"vour they courted, and hoped to earn, by that Violence." This happened in 412. All we know of *Lazarus* is, that he was ordain-

[c] Idem ibid. [d] Mercat. comm. c. 1. Vide Bar. ad ann. 417. n. 19, 20, &c.

cd

ed Biſhop of *Aix* in *Province*, by *Proculus* Biſhop of *Marſeilles*, a Prelate of extraordinary Merit, as appears from the high Commendations beſtowed on him by the Council of *Turin* [e], by St. *Jerom* [f], and by *Tiro Proſper* in his Chronicle. *Patroclus*, who was intruded in the room of *Heros*, is painted by *Tiro Proſper*, a Writer no-ways prejudiced againſt the *Pelagians* or their Friends, as a Man of a moſt abandoned Life, and one who turned the Epiſcopacy into a Trade, and ſold the Prieſthood to all who had Money to purchaſe it [g]. *Baronius* interprets the violent Death, which he ſuffered in 426. when he was barbarouſly murdered by a Military Tribune, as a Puniſhment from Heaven for his criminal Intruſion [h]. Such were the Characters of *Heros*, *Lazarus*, and *Patroclus*; and yet of the latter, who favoured the *Pelagians*, *Zoſimus* entertained the higheſt Opinion, and often commends him in his Letters as a Man of great Merit and Virtue. But the Two former, who had diſtinguiſhed themſelves above the reſt in oppoſing the *Pelagians*, he moſt outrageouſly abuſes, ſtyling them, in his Second Letter to the *African* Biſhops, *Two Plagues*, who, with their nonſenſical Whims, diſturbed the Peace and Tranquillity of the whole Church; *Whirlwinds and Storms*, that could ſuffer none to enjoy any Quiet. He adds, that he was not at all ſurpriſed at their wickedly attempting to defame, with falſe Depoſitions and lying Evidences, a Layman, meaning *Pelagius*, who had ſerved God ſo long with an untainted Reputation, and ſhining Virtues, ſince they had raiſed ſo many Storms in the Church, had contrived ſo many Plots, employed ſo many Engines, to compaſs the Ruin of their Brethren and Collegues in the Epiſcopacy [i]. No Mention is made by the Hiſtorians of thoſe Times of any other Storms, or Diſturbances, in the Churches of *Gaul*, but ſuch as were occaſioned by the Expulſion of *Heros*, and the Intruſion of *Patrocles*; and theſe *Proculus* probably exaggerated beyond Meaſure, laying the whole Blame on *Heros*. For *Proculus* was in *Rome* at the very Time *Zoſimus* wrote his Letter to the *African* Biſhops, fraught with Invectives againſt *Heros* and *Lazarus* [k]. In the ſame Letter *Zoſimus* charges the Two Prelates with ſeveral other Crimes; *viz.* that they had both been ordained againſt the *Canons*, and againſt the Will of the People as well as the Clergy, whom, however they had forced by Chains, Priſons, Confiſcations, and the Favour of the Tyrant, meaning, no doubt, the Uſurper *Conſtantine*, to

Heros *and* Lazarus *falſly charged with many Crimes by* Zoſimus.

[e] Conc. t. 2. p. 1115. [f] Hier. ep. 4. [g] Tiro Proſp. p. 51. [h] Bar. ad ann. 426. n. 26. [i] Bar. ibid. [k] Conc. t. 2. p. 1571.

consent in the End to their Election; that *Lazarus* had ascended the Episcopal Throne, while his Hands were still reeking with innocent Blood, *&c.* But, had they been guilty of such Excesses, would *Prosper*, who lived at this very Time, and all the other Historians, have passed them over in Silence? Would he have styled *Heros* an holy Man? Would St. *Austin* have called them both his holy Brethren [l]? Would the Fathers of the Council of *Carthage* in 416. have acknowleged them for their Fellow-Labourers and Collegues in the Priesthood [m]? Would *Proculus* of *Marseilles*, one of the most illustrious Prelates at that Time in *Gaul*, have ordained *Lazarus*, while his Hands were still reeking with innocent Blood? We may therefore, upon the Whole, agree here with *Baronius* [n], and ascribe the Crimes, of which the two Prelates were arraigned by *Zosimus*, to the Suggestions of their Enemies, especially of *Patroclus*, in whom *Zosimus* reposed an intire Confidence. However that be, *Zosimus*, highly incensed against both, not only declared them deposed, as Men unworthy of the Episcopal Dignity, but cut them off from his Communion, *for many Reasons*, says he, *and, among the rest, because they had deposed themselves* [o].

They are both degraded and excommunicated by Zosimus.

This Sentence he pronounced in their Absence, without even acquainting them with the Crimes laid to their Charge; not reflecting, in the Height of his Passion, that he was, at that very Time, complaining of the *African* Bishops for having condemned *Cælestius* in his Absence, reproaching them with too much Haste and Precipitation, and laying it down as a Rule never to be swerved from, that no Man ought to be condemned before he is heard, let the Crimes laid to his Charge be ever so great. As for their *deposing themselves*, or voluntarily abdicating their Dignity, it is very certain, if *Prosper* is to be credited, that *Heros* did not abdicate, but was violently driven from his See. If *Lazarus* abdicated (for Cardinal *Noris* [p] and others [q] are of Opinion he did not), that ought not to have been imputed to him as a Crime, no more than it was to *Nazianzen* Bishop of *Constantinople*, and many others, who were not even censured by their Enemies on that Account. The other Bishops seem to have made no Account of the Anathemas of *Zosimus*; for they still continued to communicate with them, and acknowlege them for their Collegues [r];

The Injustice of this Sentence.

The other Bishops make no account of the Anathemas of Zosimus.

[l] Aug. Gest. Pel. c. 16. [m] Idem ep. 90. [n] Bar. ad ann. 417. n. 23. [o] Bar. ibid. n. 27, 28, 29. [p] Noris Hist. Pel. l. 1. c. 12. [q] Gallia Christiana, t. 1. p. 2. [r] Merc. comment. c. 3.

the

the Name of *Heros* was inſerted into the Diptychs of the Church of *Arles* after his Death; and *Lazarus* was, according to ſome, even reſtored to his See [s].

Not long after *Zoſimus* had wrote the Letter, which I have mentioned above, to the Biſhops of *Africa* in favour of *Cæleſtius*, he received one from *Praylius* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, warmly recommending to him the Cauſe of *Pelagius*; and another from *Pelagius* himſelf, in his own Vindication, and with it a Confeſſion of his Faith. Theſe Letters were directed to *Innocent*; but he being dead before they reached *Rome*, they were delivered to *Zoſimus*. In the Confeſſion of Faith *Pelagius* owned, that *Baptiſm ought to be adminiſtred to Children as well as to the Adult*; and that, *notwithſtanding our Free-will, we want the Aſſiſtance of Grace* [t]. Neither of theſe Propoſitions was inconſiſtent with, or repugnant to, his Doctrine; for though he denied Original Sin, he allowed Baptiſm to be adminiſtred even to Children, but *only for their Sanctification*. He admitted the Neceſſity of *Grace*, but not Grace as that Word was underſtood by St. *Auſtin* and the other Biſhops who oppoſed him: for by Grace he meant no more than the Remiſſion of Sins, Inſtruction, the Example of Chriſt. In this Confeſſion he did not diſown any of his Tenets; but, not thinking it ſafe or adviſeable openly to own them, he induſtriouſly declined explaining himſelf more diſtinctly on either of the above-mentioned Heads. *Zoſimus*, however fully ſatisfied with his Confeſſion, and quite aſtoniſhed (to uſe his own Words) at the raſh Proceedings of the *African* Biſhops, in condemning, as Heretics, Men whoſe Doctrine was ſo ſound and orthodox, immediately tranſmitted to *Aurelius* of *Carthage*, and his Collegues in *Africa*, the Confeſſion as well as the Letter which had been ſent him by *Pelagius*. On this Occaſion he wrote himſelf a Second Letter to the *African* Biſhops, which we may juſtly ſtyle a Panegyric on *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius*, and a bitter Invective againſt their Accuſers, *Heros* and *Lazarus*. This Letter he concludes with exhorting the Biſhops of *Africa* to the Love of Peace and Unity, and condemning, as guilty of an Injuſtice unknown even to the Pagan *Romans*, thoſe who gave Judgment in the Abſence of the Perſons accuſed, what Crimes ſoever were laid to their Charge [u], as I have obſerved above.

Pelagius tranſmits to Zoſimus a Confeſſion of his Faith;

which he approves of,

and cenſures the African Biſhops for condemning him.

[s] Gall. Chriſt. ibid. ad ann. 417. n. 25, 29.

[t] Aug. Gr. Ch. c. 30. & Pecc. Orig. c. 18, 19.

[u] Bar.

The African *Bishops maintain their former Judgment.*

The *African* Bishops were no less surprised to find *Zosimus* so warmly engaged in favour of *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*, than *Zosimus* was surprised at their having condemned them. However, they were determined to stand to the Judgment which they had given, though sensible that such a Determination would not fail to produce, if *Zosimus* did not yield, a Misunderstanding, and perhaps an intire Separation, between *Rome* and *Africa*. This St. *Austin* seems chiefly to have apprehended, and to have been resolved, if it should so happen, to abdicate and retire [w]. To prevent this Evil, which would have proved very detrimental to the common Cause, many Letters passed between *Rome* and *Africa* [x]: but as none of those that were written at this Juncture by the *African* Bishops have reached our Times, having been probably destroyed by those whose Interest it was to destroy them; all we know concerning this Affair is, that the *Africans* maintained, with great Steadiness, their former Judgment against the Pretensions of *Zosimus*; and would never allow a Cause, that had been determined in *Africa*, to be re-examined at *Rome*, the rather as *Innocent*, the Predecessor of *Zosimus*, had concurred with them in condemning both *Cælestius* and his Doctrine [y]. The Letter from *Zosimus* to the *African* Bishops was carried by one *Basilius*, Subdeacon of *Rome*, who was charged with a verbal Order for the Deacon *Paulinus*, the first who accused *Cælestius*, to repair to *Rome*. To this Summons *Paulinus* returned Answer, that as the Bishops of *Africa* had condemned *Cælestius* upon his Accusation, it was no longer incumbent upon him, but upon them, to shew that his Accusation was well grounded; and therefore he could not conceive why *Zosimus* should require him to take a Journey to *Rome* [z].

Paulinus, *summoned to* Rome, *refuses to obey the Summons.*

The Council of Carthage *condemns anew the* Pelagian *Doctrine without waiting for the Judgment of* Zosimus.

In the mean time *Aurelius* of *Carthage* was under the greatest Apprehension lest *Zosimus* should be prevailed upon by *Cælestius*, and the other *Pelagians* at *Rome*, to take some hasty Step in their Favour. Having therefore assembled, with all possible Expedition, a Council at *Carthage*, he first wrote, in his own and their Name, to *Zosimus*, earnestly intreating him to suspend all further Proceedings in an Affair of such Moment, till he was more fully informed. This Letter was wrote, and a Messenger dispatched with it to *Rome*, while the Council was yet very thin; the Haste *Aurelius* was in to stop the Proceedings of *Zosimus* not allowing him to wait the Arrival of all. When

[w] Hier. ep. 195, 209. [x] Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. [y] Aug. ib. & Bar. ad ann. 418. n. 4. & Quesnel. in Leon. opera. p. 676. [z] Quesnel. ibid. p. 675.

the

the reſt came, and they were in all Two hundred and Fourteen, they unanimouſly confirmed their former Sentence, and, without waiting for the Judgment of *Zoſimus*, condemned anew the Doctrine of *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius* [a]. The Decrees which they made on this Occaſion againſt the *Pelagians* were received, ſays *Proſper*, by *Rome*, by the Emperors, no doubt, *Honorius* and *Arcadius*, and by the whole World [b]. And yet, in the making of theſe Decrees, the Biſhop of *Rome* had no Hand; ſo that it was not *Rome*, but *Africa*; it was not the Pope, but the Biſhops of *Africa*, or more truly St. *Auſtin* (for he governed intirely that Council) who taught the Church what ſhe was to believe, and what disbelieve, concerning *Grace* and Original Sin. One of theſe Decrees is related by *Proſper* [c], wherein the Two hundred and Fourteen Biſhops declare, that *we are aided by Grace, not only in the Knowlege, but in the Practice, of Virtue; and that without it we can neither think, ſpeak, or do any thing whatſoever that is pious or holy* [d]. This, and the other Decrees of the Council, were ſent immediately to *Rome* by the Fathers, who compoſed them, with a Letter for *Zoſimus*, declaring that they were determined to adhere to the Judgment, which his Predeceſſor *Innocent* had formerly given againſt *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius*, till ſuch time as both owned, and in the moſt plain and unexceptionable Terms, the Neceſſity of Grace, and abjured the oppoſite Doctrine. It was the Effect of a refined Policy in the *African* Biſhops not to mention their own Judgment, but to lay the whole Streſs on that of *Innocent*, though his was not only preceded, but produced, or rather extorted, by theirs. They hoped that the Regard, which they pretended to have for *Innocent*, would bring *Zoſimus* to a better Temper, and divert him from abſolving thoſe whom his Predeceſſor had ſo lately condemned. As *Zoſimus* had reproached them in his Letter for believing too eaſily thoſe who had appeared againſt *Cæleſtius*, they in their turn repreſented to him, that he ought not ſo eaſily to have believed *Cæleſtius*, and thoſe who ſpoke in his Favour. In the ſame Letter they gave him a particular Account of all that had paſſed in *Africa* concerning *Cæleſtius*. No wonder therefore that *Zoſimus* ſhould have complained of the Length of their Letter, calling it a Volume, and ſaying that

The Policy of the African Biſhops.

[a] Proſp. chr. & in coll. c. 10. [b] Proſp. chron. in Ingrat. l. 1. c. 2. [c] Proſp. in Ingrat. l. 1. c. 3. [d] Idem ibid. [e] Proſp. ibid. l. 1. c. 2. Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. & Pecc. Orig. c. 8. Bar. ad ann. 418. n. 5, 12.

he had got through it at last [e]. With this Letter *Marcellinus*, Subdeacon of the Church of *Carthage*, was dispatched to *Rome*, and arrived there in the Beginning of *March* 418.

Zosimus *begins to yield.*

Zosimus was alarmed at the Steadiness of the *Africans*. He plainly saw from their Letter, and more plainly from their Decrees, that they were determined not to yield; and therefore, apprehending the evil Consequences that would infallibly attend his continuing to protect *Pelagius* and *Cælestius* against them, he resolved to yield, and withdraw, by Degrees, his Protection from both. Hence, in his Answer to the Council, he contented himself with setting forth and boasting the Pre-eminence, Authority, and Prerogatives of the Apostolic See; which however, more modest than his Predecessor, he did not ascribe to Divine Institution, but to the Canons of the Church, and Prescription. He tells the *African* Bishops, that though he is vested with a Power of judging all Causes, though his Judgment is irreversible, yet he had chosen to determine nothing without having first consulted them; and this he dwells upon as an extraordinary Favour. He expresses great Surprize at their seeming to be persuaded, that he had given an intire Credit to *Cælestius*, assures them that he had not been so hasty, being well apprised that the last and definitive Judgment ought not to be given but with the greatest Caution, and after the most mature Deliberation; and in the Close of his Letter lets them know, that, upon the Receipt of their first Letter, he had suspended all further Proceedings; and, to gratify them, left Things in the State they were in before [f].

His boasting Letter to the African *Bishops.*

The Doctrine of Pelagius *condemned again in a Council at* Carthage.

In the mean time the *African* Bishops, assembling in Council at *Carthage*, from all the Provinces of *Africa*, and some even from *Spain*, the more effectually to oppose and defeat any further Attempts of *Zosimus*, in favour of *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*, condemned their Doctrine anew, and more distinctly than they had hitherto done. This Council met on the 1st of *May* 418. consisted of 225 Bishops, and enacted Eight Canons, anathematizing the *Pelagian* Doctrine concerning Grace and Original Sin [g]. To these Eight Canons they added Ten more, calculated to establish some Points of Discipline. Among the latter the Ninth deserves particular Notice; for it is there decreed, That Presbyters, Deacons, and inferior Clerks, if they complain of

[f] Bar. ibid. [g] Conc. l. 2. p. 1121. Aug. ep. 47.

the

the Judgment of their own Bishop, may appeal, with his Consent, to the neighbouring Bishops, and from them to the Primate or Council of *Africa*. *But, if any one should presume*, say they, *to appeal beyond Sea, let no Man receive him to his Communion* [h]. To this Decree *Gratian* has added, to save the Jurisdiction of the Pope, *unless they appeal to the See of* Rome; than which nothing can be more absurd, since it was to restrain the encroaching Power of the See of *Rome* that this Canon was made. We must not forget that St. *Austin* was present at this Council, and signed this, as well as the other Canons and Decrees, that were, on this Occasion, enacted by the 225 Bishops.

Appeals beyond Sea forbidden by the Council, on Pain of Excommunication.

Law enacted by Honorius *against the* Pelagians.

The *Africans* had dispatched, the Year before, the Bishop *Vindemialis* to the Court of *Honorius*, with the Decrees of the Council held against *Pelagius*, of which I have spoken above. And those Decrees the Emperor not only approved, but enacted this Year 418. a severe Law against the *Pelagians*, dated from *Ravenna*, the 30th of *April*, and addressed to *Palladius* then *Præfectus Prætorio*. *Honorius* there declares, he had been informed, that *Pelagius* and *Cælestius* taught, in Opposition to the Authority of the Catholic Church, that God had created the first Man mortal; that he would have died, whether he had or had not sinned; that his Sin did not pass to his Descendents; and several other impious Errors, that disturbed the Peace and Tranquillity of the Church. To put a Stop therefore to the growing Evil, he commands *Pelagius* and *Cælestius* to be driven from *Rome*; orders it to be every-where notified, that all Persons shall be admitted before the Magistrates, as Informers against those who are suspected of holding their wicked Doctrines; and such as are found guilty shall be sent into Exile [i]. In virtue of this Law, an Order was issued by the *Præfecti Prætorio*, *viz.* by *Junius Quartus Palladius* Prefect of *Italy*, *Monaxius* Prefect of the East, and *Agricola* Prefect of *Gaul*, commanding *Pelagius* and *Cælestius* to be driven out of *Rome*, and the Accomplices of their Errors to be stript of their Estates, and condemned to perpetual Banishment [k]. A most barbarous Treatment for holding Opinions, which, if erroneous, were certainly harmless. But it is usual for a persecuting Spirit to be as

[h] Conc. l. 2. p. 1064. Nor. hist. Pel. l. 1. c. 17.
[i] Bar. ad ann. 418. n. 20.
[k] Bar. ad ann. 420. n. 4. Nor. hist. Pel. p. 88.

violent upon the most unessential as the most weighty Points: and the Rage of Disputation is never more keen, than when the Disputants can hardly define what they quarrel about; especially when the Sword of the Magistrate is drawn on that Side which has least to say for itself in Reason and Argument. I do not affirm this was the Case in the present Dispute; but this is certain, that if *Pelagius* went too far in his Opinion, so did his Opposers in theirs: and so far his Conduct was infinitely better than theirs, that he declared his own Notions to be Matters very indifferent to the Catholic Faith, and professed a general Assent to that Faith; whereas they anathematized his Opinions as execrable Errors, and punished them with all the Severity that the most implacable Malice could exert (B).

Zosimus *summons* Cælestius *to appear before him, and to condemn his Doctrine.*

Pelagius and *Cælestius* being thus condemned by the Decrees of the *African* Bishops, by the Law of the Emperor, and even by the Voice of the People, or rather of the Populace, who were everywhere ready, but no-where more than at *Rome*, to rise against the *Enemies of Grace*, as they were styled, and their Abettors; *Zosimus* thought it not safe to afford them any further Protection, unless *Cælestius*, who was still at *Rome* (the Imperial Law not being yet published there), consented to anathematize the Doctrines ascribed to him and *Pelagius*, in such clear and precise Terms as should leave no room, even for his Enemies, to question his Sincerity. He therefore appointed a Day for the *Roman* Clergy, and the neighbouring Bishops, to assemble; and, acquainting *Cælestius* with this Resolution, he summoned him to appear at the Time appointed, that, by condemning whatever he should be required to condemn, he might be publicly restored to the Communion of the Church, from which he had been cut off by the *African* Bishops. *Cælestius* was greatly perplexed with this Summons: he conceived it impossible to dissemble any longer his real Sentiments; but, at the same time, thinking it base to renounce them, and foreseeing the Consequences that would infallibly attend his avowing them, after he had been long in Suspense what Expedient to resolve on, he concluded at last, that the best and safest was privately to withdraw from *Rome*, and keep himself concealed till the present Storm was blown over. This Expedient he chose, and put it in Execution with such Secrecy, that he

Cælestius *instead of appearing retires from* Rome.

(B) *Honorius* supposes, and likewise his Prefects, *Pelagius* to have been in *Rome*, when this Law was enacted; but it is very certain, that he was then in *Palæstine*.

was

was no more heard of till Three Years after, when he appeared again in *Rome* [m].

In the mean time the appointed Day came; but *Cælestius* did not appear: he was summoned anew, and the Proceedings were adjourned for a few Days; but as he still absented himself, and no Tidings could be heard of him, *Zosimus* was so provoked in seeing himself thus deluded, that, without further Examination, he condemned the Confession of Faith, which he had approved before; confirmed the Sentence of the *Africans*, which he had so sharply censured; and, anathematizing the Doctrine both of *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*, declared the one and the other cut off from the Communion of the Church, if they did not publicly renounce and abjure *the poisonous Tenets of their impious and abominable Sect* [n]. He did not stop here; but, to retrieve his Reputation, which had suffered greatly on this Occasion, and to atone by an opposite Zeal, for that which he had hitherto exerted in their Favour, he wrote a long circular Letter to all the Bishops, anathematizing the Doctrine of *Pelagius*, and exhorting them to follow his Example. Copies of this Letter were sent into all the Provinces of the Christian World, and out of so great a Number of Bishops Eighteen only were found, who refused to receive it, and confirm, with their Subscriptions, the Anathemas it contained [o].

Zosimus condemns the Confession, which he had approved before.

Excommunicates Pelagius *and* Cælestius.

And writes a circular Letter against them.

As for the Eighteen Bishops, who refused to join the rest, they alleged, that they could not, in Conscience, condemn any Man in his Absence, and that it was but just they should first hear what he had to plead in his Defence, quoting to that Purpose the very Passages of Scripture which *Zosimus* had quoted in his Letter to the *Africans*, censuring them for condemning *Pelagius* in his Absence. They added, that, as for *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*, they had condemned, in their Writings, the Errors imputed to them, and therefore did not deserve, in their Opinion, the Anathemas that *Rome* and *Africa* had, perhaps too hastily, thundered against them. *Julian*, Bishop of *Eclana* in *Campania*, one of the Eighteen, and the most distinguished among them, wrote Two Letters on this Subject to *Zosimus*, one of which was signed by them all, and contained a

Some Bishops refuse to sign it.

And send a Confession of their Faith to Zosimus.

[m] Aug. Pecc. orig. c. 8. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. Mar. Merc. comm. c. 1. [n] Aug. Pecc. orig. c. 3, & 4. in Jul. l. 1. c. 4. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. Mercat. ubi supra. Prosp. chr. & Ingrat. l. 1. c. 3. [o] Aug. in Jul. l. 1. c. 4. Conc. t. 3. p. 349. Prosp. chr. Merc. c. 3.

Confession of their Faith, agreeing, in the most material Points, with the Confessions of *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*. For there they absolutely reject, and in the strongest Terms, Original Sin, under the Name of *Natural Sin*; but allow (and in this Article alone they differ from *Pelagius*), that by the Sin of *Adam* Death was let into the World. They intreat *Zosimus* to acquaint them with what should be found amiss in their Confession; but beg, that he would not think of employing Force, since no Force but that of Conviction, could produce in them a Change of Sentiments. They let him know, in the End of their Letter, that they have already appealed to the Judgment of an Oecumenical Council [p]. *Zosimus* was so provoked at this Appeal, that, upon the Receipt of the Letter, he assembled, in great Haste, a Council, consisting of the *Roman* Clergy, and the neighbouring Bishops; and, having caused the Letter to be read in their Presence, he condemned anew *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*, and with them *Julian*, and the other Bishops, who signed it, declaring them guilty of the same Errors, and in Consequence thereof degraded, as incorrigible Heretics, from the Episcopal Dignity. The Prelates, thus degraded, had recourse to the Emperor *Honorius*, complaining of the undeserved Severity of *Zosimus*, and intreating him to convene, by his Authority, an Oecumenical Council, to the Judgment of which they were ready to submit both themselves and their Doctrine. The Emperor seemed at first inclined to grant them their Request. But Count *Valerius*, a great Friend of St. *Austin*, and then very powerful at Court, not only diverted *Honorius* from it, but prevailed upon him to enact a Law, banishing from *Italy Julian*, and with him all the Bishops, whom *Zosimus* had deposed [q]. This Law was soon followed by another, commanding all Bishops to sign the Condemnation of *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*, on Pain of Deposition, and perpetual Banishment [r]. The *Pelagians* interpreted their being refused a Council, as a Token of Victory; whence *Julian*, in a Letter which he wrote to his Friends in *Rome*, insults his Adversaries, as if they had distrusted their Cause, and therefore declined the Judgment of an Oecumenical Council [s]. In another Place he reproaches St. *Austin*, in particular, for courting the Friendship of Men in Power, especially of Count *Valerius*, with no other View but to crush, by their means,

They are condemned and degraded by Zosimus.

They recur to the Emperor for a general Council.

Who issues several Laws against them.

[p] Merc. subnot. p. 320—326. [q] Aug. op. imperf. l. 1. c. 10. ad Val. p. 343. Conc. t. 2. p. 1558. [r] Mer. Com. c. 3. Nor. hist. Pel. l. 1. c. 16. [s] Aug. in Jul. l. 3. c. 1. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 24.

thoſe whom he could not convince. St. *Auſtin* anſwered, *That Recourſe indeed had been had to Men in Power, but that the* Pelagians *ought rather to be thankful, than to complain, on that Score, ſince it was not to cruſh them, or to do them the leaſt Hurt* (for they were only driven from their Sees, and baniſhed for Life), *that the Intereſt and Power of great Men had been made uſe of, but merely to reclaim them from their ſacrilegious Temerity* [t]. Might not a *Decius*, a *Dioclefian*, or any other Perſecutor of the Church, have uſed the ſame Plea to juſtify his Perſecution?

The Pelagian *Doctrine condemned by Two Councils in the Eaſt.*

About this time, that is, in the Latter-end of the Year 418. or the Beginning of 419. the Doctrine of *Pelagius* was condemned in a Council held at *Antioch*, at which preſided *Theodotius* Biſhop of that City; and in another, that met about the Year 421. in *Cilicia*, under the famous *Theodorus* of *Mopſueſtia*, who had been hitherto an avowed Patron of the *Pelagians*, had received *Julian* when driven out of *Italy*, and even written a Book againſt St. *Auſtin*, in Defence of the *Pelagian* Doctrine [u]. His Converſion was perhaps owing, as that of many others certainly was, to the ſevere Laws enacted againſt the *Pelagians*. Soon after the Council of *Antioch*, *Pelagius*, whom *Jerom* ſtyles the *Second Catiline*, was driven from *Jeruſalem*, where he had lived a long time, and obliged to fly to ſome other Place for Shelter [w]. Whither he retired, or what became of him afterwards, is not recorded. St. *Auſtin* ſuppoſes both him and *Cæleſtius* to have been ſtill alive, while he was writing againſt *Julian*, that is, about the Year 421 [x]. As for *Cæleſtius*, it appears from a Reſcript, or rather a Letter, of the Emperor *Conſtantius* to *Voluſianus*, Prefect of *Rome*, in 421. that he was then in that City. For *Conſtantius* writes to *Voluſianus*, that though he had enacted ſome Laws againſt the ancient as well as the modern Hereſies, yet he was informed, that they made daily great Progreſs; and therefore, to prevent the Diſturbances that muſt ariſe from thence, he commands the Laws to be put in Execution, and the Enemies of the true Religion to be carefully ſought for, eſpecially *Cæleſtius*, and to be baniſhed, if apprehended, aa Hundred Miles from *Rome*. To this Letter the Emperor added, with his own Hand, by way of Poſtſcript, that the Reputation of *Voluſianus* depended on the punctual Execution of this Order [y]. In Obedience to the Emperor's Commands, *Voluſianus* iſſued a Procla-

Pelagius *driven from* Jeruſalem.

Cæleſtius *returns to* Rome.

Law iſſued againſt him.

[t] Aug. op. imperf. l. 2. c. 14. [u] Merc. Comm. c. 3. [w] Hier. ep. 55. [x] Aug. in Jul. l. 2. c. 10. [y] Bar. ad ann. 420. n. 2.

mation, baniſhing *Cæleſtius* an Hundred Miles from *Rome*, and threatening with Proſcription all who ſhould preſume to conceal him [z]. *Cæleſtius* however appeared again in *Rome* Three Years after, and even applied to *Cæleſtine*, then in that See, to have his Cauſe examined anew. But *Cæleſtine*, rejecting his Requeſt with Indignation, cauſed him to be baniſhed all *Italy* [a]. From *Rome* he repaired to *Conſtantinople*, with *Julian*, and the other Biſhops of the *Pelagian* Party, who all met there with a more kind Reception. The Emperor *Theodoſius* the younger was even inclined to aſſemble, at their Requeſt, a great Council; and *Neſtorius*, then Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, wrote to the Pope in their Favour. But, in the mean time, *Marius Mercator* having compoſed, and preſented to the Emperor, a Memorial againſt them, they were ordered by *Theodoſius*, in virtue of that Memorial, to depart the City [b]. Of *Cæleſtius* no farther Mention is made by any of the Antients. As for *Julian*, he wandered, for ſeveral Years, from Place to Place, being every-where abhorred, deteſted, and driven out by the Populace, as if his Preſence had been enough to draw down from Heaven ſome remarkable Judgment upon them. However, he found an Aſylum at laſt in a ſmall Village of *Sicily*, where he earned a Livelihood by keeping a School, till the Year 455. when he died, after he had diveſted himſelf of all he had, to relieve the Poor of the Place in a great Famine [c]. He was a Man of a ſprightly Genius, thoroughly acquainted with the Scriptures, well verſed in all the Branches of polite Literature, eſpecially in the *Greek* and *Latin* Poets, and once famous among the Doctors of the Church [d]. He was deſcended from an illuſtrious Family. His Father was an *Italian* Biſhop, for whom St. *Auſtin*, notwithſtanding his irreconcileable Averſion to the Son, profeſſed the greateſt Friendſhip and Veneration [e]. His Mother was a Lady of the firſt Quality, and yet more commendable for her Virtue than her Birth [f]. His Enemies envying him even his noble Deſcent, ſtrove to rob him of that Honour, ſmall as it is, in Compariſon of his other Endowments, by giving out, that he was a ſuppoſititious Child [g]. He was admitted by his Father among the Clergy, when he was yet very young, and married, when he was of a more mature Age, to a Lady named *Ja*, of a Senatorial, nay, of the *Æmilian* Family, and the

Is baniſhed all Italy.

Is driven from Conſtantinople, *together with* Julian *and the other* Pelagian *Biſhops.*

Julian *dies in* Sicily.

His Birth, Education, &c.

[z] Phot. c. 53. [a] Proſp. in Coll. c. 41. [b] Vid. Garn. in Mercat. p. 144. [c] Gennad. c. 45. [d] Idem ibid. [e] Aug. in Jul. l. 1. c. 4. & op. imperf. l. 1. c. 68. [f] Merc. ſubnot. c. 4. Aug. op. imperf. p. 22. [g] Merc. ib. p. 40.

Daughter

Daughter of *Æmilius* Bishop of *Benevento* [h]. St. *Paulinus*, Bishop of *Nola*, did not think it beneath him to write an Epithalamium on this Occasion, of a most singular kind; for he advises him and his Bride to continue Virgins, and observe Continency [i]. A very extraordinary Advice on a Wedding-Day! That the married Couple agreed to it then, we are not told; but, not long after, probably on the Death of his Wife, *Julian* bound himself to the Observance of Continency; for he was ordained Deacon, and soon after raised to the See of *Eclana* [k]. He had long before embraced the *Pelagian* Doctrine; and was so fully convinced of the Truth of it, that he often declared, if *Pelagius* himself should renounce his Doctrine, yet he would not [l]. These Sentiments he maintained to the last, chusing rather to be driven from his See, and deprived of all the Comforts of Life, than to abjure Opinions which he thought true, or admit Opinions which he thought false. He was buried in the Place where he died; and his Tomb was discovered in the Ninth Century, with the following Epitaph; *Here rests in Peace* Julian *a Catholic Bishop*. From this Epitaph some have concluded, that he renounced at last the *Pelagian* Doctrine, and died a good Catholic. But they were not, it seems, aware, that the *Pelagians* constantly styled themselves Catholics, stigmatizing St. *Austin*, and the rest who opposed them, with the Name of *Manichees*.

Julian is supposed to have dissented in some Points from *Pelagius*, in those especially that relate to Grace, and thereby to have introduced, or laid down such Principles as naturally tended to introduce, the *Semipelagian* Doctrine; which may be reduced to the following Heads: 1. That when the Truth has been sufficiently declared, we may, by our own Freewill, without the Help of preventing Grace, begin to believe it; so that the first Beginning of our Faith cannot be properly called *a Gift of God*, but, *our own Act*. 2. That for all other good Works Grace is necessary (and here they differed from the *Pelagians*); but is never denied to a Man, who, by the good Use of his Freewill, has begun to believe. Thus, according to them, Grace was the Reward of Faith, and not Faith the Effect of Grace, which was the Doctrine of St. *Austin*. 3. That, by Grace preceding our Merits, no more can be meant, than the natural Grace and Bounty of God, given to Man in his Reason, and the

The Semipelagian *Doctrine.*

[h] Paulin. car. 14. Mer. Comm. c. 3. [i] Idem ibid. [l] Aug. ep. 106. [k] Aug. in Jul. l. 3. c. 21. et l. 4. c. 11.

natural

natural Faculties of his Soul; by the good Use of which, he may render himself worthy of the extraordinary Grace that is necessary for him to work out his Salvation. 4. That the Children who die before they attain to the Years of Discretion, are eternally rewarded or punished, according to the good or bad Life they would have led, had they attained to the Years of Discretion. A most impious Tenet! making God punish Sins with eternal Misery that were never committed: yet not quite so impious as that of St. *Austin*; who, without having recourse to the Supposition of Crimes foreseen, supposed innocent Children to be eternally damned for a Crime committed by *Adam*, if, by the Fault of their Parents, they were not baptized. Other Tenets of the *Semipelagians* were these: 5. That the Notion of Election and Reprobation, independent on our Merits or Demerits, is maintaining a fatal Necessity, is the Bane of all Virtue, and serves only to render good Men remiss in working out their Salvation, and to drive Sinners to Despair. 6. That the Decrees of Election and Reprobation are posterior to, and in consequence of our good or evil Works, as foreseen by God from all Eternity. On these Two last Propositions the *Jesuits* found their whole System of *Grace* and Freewill, agreeing therein with the *Semipelagians* against the *Jansenists* and St. *Austin*; though, not daring to contradict *the Doctor of Grace*, as he is styled, they pretend their Doctrine, and not that of the *Jansenists*, to be the true Doctrine of St. *Austin*; which has occasioned endless Disputes, and endless Volumes. The latter Popes have all favoured the *Semipelagians* or *Jesuits* against the *Jansenists* and St. *Austin*; and *Clement* XI. above all the rest, by his famous Bull *Unigenitus*. But the Popes who lived nearer those Times, especially *Gelasius* and *Hormisda*, were all zealous Asserters of the Doctrine of St. *Austin*; nay, *Hormisda* declared the Doctrine contained in the Books of that Father, namely, in those he wrote on *Predestination* and *Perseverance*, to be the Doctrine of the Catholic Church; which was declaring every true Catholic to be a *Predestinarian* [m]. For the Doctrine of Predestination (as Predestination has been since understood by *Calvin* and his Followers) is there laid down in the plainest Terms; which so shocked some Persons, otherwise eminent for their Piety, say *Prosper* and *Hilarius* [n], that they could not help censuring it, as a Doctrine repugnant to the Sense of

The System of the Jesuits *founded on the* Semipelagian *Doctrine.*

[m] Concil. t. 4. p. 1531.

[n] Prosp. et Hil. Literæ ad Aug. l. 7. p. 542—546.

the

the Church and the Fathers; nay, as a Doctrine, which, were it even true, ought not to be made public, ſince it was not neceſſary that Men ſhould know it; and if they did, it would render all Exhortations to good Works vain and uſeleſs [p]. But theſe, ſay the *Jeſuits*, pretending their Syſtem to be the pure Doctrine of St. *Auſtin*, miſunderſtood that Father, as did *Fauſtus* the famous Abbot of *Lerins*, when he wrote, *That if it be true, that ſome are predeſtined to Life, and others to Deſtruction, as a certain holy Man* (St. *Auſtin*) *has ſaid, we are not born to be judged, but we are judged before we are born; ſo that there can be no Equity in the Day of Judgment* [q]. To ſpeak impartially, it is no eaſy Matter to determine what Syſtem St. *Auſtin* had formed to himſelf, with reſpect to Grace, Freewill, and Predeſtination: for, in one Place, he ſeems to reject and condemn what he had been labouring to prove and eſtabliſh in another. Hence *Julian*, whoſe Underſtanding was far more methodical, uſed often to quote him againſt himſelf, as the *Jeſuits* and *Janſeniſts* ſtill do in maintaining their Syſtems, though diametrically oppoſite, to be intirely agreeable to his Doctrine. He was apt to run into Extremes, and, in confuting one Error, to lay a Foundation for many others. Hence even his greateſt Admirers are often at a Loſs how to make him agree either with the Church or himſelf. However, his great Knowlege in thoſe Days, his extraordinary Zeal for what he called the Catholic Doctrine, and, above all, his heaping daily Volumes upon Volumes againſt all who oppoſed it, ſo dazled the Underſtandings of the Popes themſelves, that, looking upon him as an inſpired Writer, they ſuffered him to dictate even to them, as if he had been Pope, and they common Biſhops; as if Infallibility had been transferred from *Rome* to *Hippo*, and no longer veſted in them, but in him.

Zoſimus's quarrels with ſome Biſhops of Gaul.

But to return to *Zoſimus*: As his Partiality to *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius* occaſioned a Quarrel between him and the *African* Biſhops; his Partiality to *Patroclus*, who had uſurped the See of *Arles*, as I have related above [s], occaſioned, in like manner, a Quarrel between him and ſome Biſhops of *Gaul*; and from the latter he reaped no more Credit or Honour, than he had done from the former. It aroſe on the following Occaſion: The Biſhops of *Arles* and *Vienne* had been long contending for the Metropolitan Dignity, and the Juriſdiction

The Occaſion of this Quarrel.

[p] Proſp. et Hil. ibid. [q] Vide Sirmond. hiſt. prædeſt. c. 1, 2, &c. [s] See p. 336, 337.

attending

attending it, over the Provinces of *Narbonne* and *Vienne:* and the Decision of the Controversy having been referred, some Years before, to a Council that was held in *Turin*, it had been there decreed, that the Bishop who should prove his City to be the Metropolis of those Provinces, according to the Civil Division of the Empire, should enjoy the Metropolitan Dignity, and the Privileges annexed to it; but, in the mean time, to avoid any Breach of Charity, that both should exercise the Jurisdiction of a Metropolitan over the Churches that were nearest to their respective Cities [t]. Thus Matters continued, till *Patroclus* repairing to *Rome*, and there imposing upon *Zosimus*, who was quite unacquainted with the Merits of the Cause, prevailed upon him, by flattering his Vanity and Ambition, to decide, in his Favour, the Controversy, which had been so long depending. *Zosimus* censured very severely, as I have observed above, the *African* Bishops, for acting, as he pretended, with too much Haste and Precipitation, in the Case of *Cælestius*. But, surely, no Man ever deserved to be more justly censured, on that score, than himself: for, not to mention the Case of *Heros* and *Lazarus*, whom he excommunicated and deposed in their Absence, and without hearing what they had to plead in their Defence, he took upon him to decide the present Controversy, which a Council had left undetermined, upon the Information given him by one of the Parties concerned, without hearing the other: for, giving an intire Credit to all *Patroclus* said or could say, in Behalf of himself and his Church, he wrote a Letter, addressed to all the Bishops of *Gaul*, declaring, that, for the future, he would receive no Bishops or Ecclesiastics coming to *Rome* from those Provinces, unless they brought with them Letters of Communion, called *Formatæ*, from the Metropolitan of *Arles*, and excommunicating those who should transgress this Order [u] (A). The Privilege of granting the *Formatæ* was only personal; for *Zosimus* did not grant it to the See of *Arles*, but to *Patroclus*, whom he styles his *holy Brother, in Consideration of his extraordinary Merit.* To such a Degree had he suffered himself to be imposed upon, by a Man, who was the Disgrace of his Order [w]. In the same Letter he vests him, as Bishop of

[t] Conc. t. 2. p. 1156. [u] Conc. t. 2. p. 1567. [w] See p. 337.

(A) These Letters were given, in the primitive Times, to traveling Ecclesiastics, that their Brethren, in the Places through which they passed, knowing who they were, and whence they came, might admit them to their Communion.

Arles,

Arles, with a Metropolitan Juriſdiction over the Province of *Vienne* and the Two Provinces of *Narbonne*, adjudges to his See all the Pariſhes and Territories that had ever been ſubject to the City of *Arles*, and grants him a full Power to decide and finally determine all Controverſies that ſhould ariſe in the three above-mentioned Provinces, provided they were not of ſuch Conſequence as required them to be examined at *Rome* [x]. The only Reaſon *Zoſimus* alleges for thus exalting the See of *Arles* to the Prejudice of the See of *Vienne*, is, becauſe *Trophimus*, the Firſt Biſhop of *Arles*, had converted thoſe Provinces to the Chriſtian Religion. A Reaſon both falſe and impertinent: falſe, becauſe *Trophimus* flouriſhed in the Year 250 [y], and the Church of *Arles* was famous as early as the Year 177. when they wrote, with their Brethren of *Lions*, to the Faithful in *Aſia* [z]: impertinent, becauſe it was to the Dignity of each City, and to nothing elſe, that the Dignity of the Sees was owing. Hence the Council of *Turin* wiſely adjudged the Metropolitan Dignity to him who ſhould prove his City to be the civil Metropolis, with reſpect to the conteſted Provinces, as I have obſerved above. *Zoſimus*, however, wrote a ſecond Letter, which he addreſſed to all the Biſhops of *Gaul*, *Spain*, and *Africa*, confirming to the See of *Arles* all the Rights and Privileges which he had granted in his Firſt, and rejecting, with Scorn, the Decree of the Council of *Turin* [a].

He is oppoſed by the Biſhops of Gaul.

The Biſhops of *Gaul*, *viz.* *Simplicius* of *Vienne*, *Hilarius* of *Narbonne*, and *Proculus* of *Marſeilles*, amazed and aſtoniſhed at the Temerity of the Biſhop of *Rome*, openly refuſed to acknowlege his Authority, or ſubmit to his Sentence. *Zoſimus*, highly provoked at the Oppoſition he met with, wrote ſeveral threatening Letters to *Hilarius* and *Proculus*, as if he were determined to cut them off from his Communion, if they did not yield, and acknowlege *Patroclus* for their Metropolitan. As for *Simplicius*, he ſeems to have acted with leſs Vigour on this Occaſion than the other Two; and it was perhaps on that Account that he has been ſainted. *Hilarius* too yielded at laſt, not to the Menaces of *Zoſimus*, which he made no Account of, but to thoſe of Count *Conſtantius*, the avowed Patron of *Patroclus* [b], whom he allowed, on that Conſideration, to ordain a Biſhop at *Lodeve*, within the Limits of his Province, which was owning him for

[x] Conc. ib. p. 1567–1569. [y] Greg. Tur. hiſt. Franc. l. 1. c. 30. [z] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 1.
[a] Conc. t. 2. p. 1568. [b] Conc. ibid. 1581.

his Metropolitan. But nothing could ſhake the Firmneſs aud Conſtancy of *Proculus*. *Zoſimus*, thinking he could frighten him into a Compliance, began with reproachful Language; from Reproaches he proceeded to Menaces; and from Menaces, to ſummon him to *Rome*, to anſwer there for his preſuming to ordain Biſhops in a Province (the *Second Narbonneſe*) that had been adjudged by the Apoſtolic See to the Metropolitan of *Arles*. But *Proculus* made ſo little Account of his Reproaches, Menaces, and Summons, that I do not even find he returned them an Anſwer. It is at leaſt certain that he did not obey the Summons, and that he continued to exerciſe the ſame Juriſdiction, which he had exerciſed before, oppoſing to the repeated and peremptory Orders of *Zoſimus* a Canon of the Council of *Turin*, appointing him Metropolitan of the *Narbonnenſis Secunda* [c]. *Zoſimus*, tranſported with Rage in ſeeing his Authority thus ſlighted, wrote Three Letters, all dated the 29th of *September* 417. *viz.* one to the People and Clergy of the Province of *Vienne*, another to thoſe of the *Second Narbonneſe*, and the third to *Patroclus*. In the two former he inveighs bitterly againſt *Proculus*, and confirms anew to *Patroclus* the Metropolitan Dignity and Juriſdiction, which have been ſo unalterably intailed, ſays he, on the See of *Arles*, by the Decrees of the Fathers and Councils, that it exceeds even the Power and Authority of the *Roman* Church to transfer them to, or intail them upon, any other [d]. This was diſclaiming, in the plaineſt Terms, the Power of diſpenſing with the Canons, which has ſince proved ſo beneficial to the Apoſtolic See. And yet *Zoſimus* was acting the whole Time in direct Oppoſition to the Fourth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, veſting, as it was underſtood by the ſubſequent Councils, the Biſhop of each Metropolis with the Metropolitan Dignity and Juriſdiction over the whole Province. *Zoſimus*, in his Letter to *Patroclus*, encourages him to reſume and exerciſe, in ſpite of *Proculus*, the Metropolitan Juriſdiction over the *Second Narbonneſe*, which *Proculus* had ſo unjuſtly invaded and uſurped. This *Patrocles* durſt not attempt, tho' ſeconded by the whole Power of the Apoſtolic See; which wrought the Pride, Ambition, and Reſentment of *Zoſimus* to ſuch a Pitch, that, giving the Reins to his Paſſion, he thundered the Sentence of Excommunication againſt *Proculus*, declared him unworthy of, and degraded from, the Epiſcopal Dignity, and committing the Church of *Marſeilles* to the Care of *Patroclus*, commanded him to exerciſe there the Juriſdiction with which he was veſted. The Power of the Apo-

eſpecially by Proculus *Biſhop of* Marſeilles.

Proculus *excommunicated and depoſed by* Zoſimus.

[c] Conc. ibid. p. 1155. [d] Conc. t. 2. p. 1570.

ſtolic

ſtolic See was now exhauſted, and what drove *Zoſimus* almoſt to Deſpair, exhauſted to no Effect: for *Proculus*, to ſhew how little Regard he paid to the Sentence pronounced againſt him at *Rome*, ordained a Biſhop ſoon after he was acquainted with it. *Zoſimus*, ſenſible that the Authority of his See was here at ſtake, would not abandon the Attempt. He wrote Two Letters more on the ſame Subject, one to *Patroclus*, exhorting him to exert, with Vigour and Severity, the Power with which he was veſted; and at the ſame time commanding him to declare, in his Name, that he ſhould never be prevailed upon to acknowlege thoſe whom *Proculus* had ordained. The other Letter was to the People, Clergy, and Magiſtrates of *Marſeilles*, ſtirring them up againſt *Proculus*, and encouraging them to drive him out, and receive another in his room at the Hands of *Patroclus*. Theſe Letters occaſioned great Diſturbances in the Church of *Marſeilles*, which was now rent into two oppoſite Parties, ſome refuſing to acknowlege *Proculus*, and others declaring that they would acknowlege no other [e]. But, in ſpite of the utmoſt Efforts of *Zoſimus*, of *Patroclus*, and their Partiſans, *Proculus* ſtill kept his Ground, ſtill continued to exerciſe all Epiſcopal as well as Metropolitan Functions, as he had formerly done. He thought even the Evils attending a Schiſm of a leſs dangerous Tendency than thoſe which he apprehended from the Encroachments of the Biſhops of *Rome*. Had all the Prelates thus ſtood up in Defence of their juſt Rights and Privileges againſt the Papal Uſurpations, the Church had never been reduced to that deplorable Thraldom, which ſhe groaned under for ſo many Ages. But, alas! there have been in all Times but too many *Simplicius's*, who, out of a miſtaken Principle, have choſen rather to yield to an encroaching Power, than to raiſe Diſturbances, and forego their own Eaſe, by withſtanding it: but too many *Patroclus's*, who, to gratify their own Ambition, have proſtituted their ſacred Dignity to the ambitious Views of the Pope, and raiſed him, at the Expence of their own Order, that they might be raiſed by him in their Turn. *Proculus*, though depoſed, excommunicated, calumniated, perſecuted by *Zoſimus* and his Tools, kept to the laſt Poſſeſſion of his See; nay, and was acknowleged for lawful Biſhop of *Marſeilles*, for Metropolitan of the *Second Narbonneſe*, not only by the Biſhops of *Gaul*, but likewiſe by thoſe of *Africa* [f]. He was ſtill alive in 427. when he condemned the Monk *Leporius* for maintaining Chriſt to have been born Man only, but to

But continues to diſcharge the Functions of his Office.

His Steadineſs in oppoſing the Encroachments of Rome.

[e] Conc. ibid. 1574. [f] Du Pin. t. 3. p. 827.

have deserved, by his good Works, to become God g. The Encomiums bestowed on him by the Council of *Turin*, by St. *Jerom*, and *Tiro Prosper*, as I have observed above, are a sufficient Confutation of all the Calumnies uttered against him by *Zosimus* and the rest of his Enemies.

Zosimus dies.

The last Letters of *Zosimus*, that is his Letters to *Patroclus* and the People of *Marseilles*, are dated the 5th of *March* 418. and he died in the Latter-end of the same Year, on the 26th of *December*, says *Baronius* h, upon the Authority, we may suppose, of some antient Pontifical (A).

His Character.

The Distemper which he died of lasted a long time, and was attended with such violent Fits, that he was often thought to be dead before he died. It was during his Illness that he wrote his last Letters; and yet they are no less remarkable than the rest for that Fire and Vivacity, that Strength of Expression, and even that Elegance and Purity of Diction, that were peculiar to him. He was a Man of great Address in the Management of Affairs; well knew how to turn every thing to his Advantage; and in the several Disputes which he engaged in, he forgot nothing that could any-ways distress those who opposed him. He was apt to engage too rashly, giving an intire Credit to those who, by a servile Submission, flattered his Ambition; and when he had once engaged in a Cause, as he was of a haughty and imperious Temper, impatient of Controul, passionate, headstrong, full of, and elated with, the Dignity of the *Apostolic See*, it required the greatest Art and Address in his Brethren to bring him into their Measures, and with-hold him from raising fatal Divisions in the Church. His whole Conduct and Behaviour towards them, the haughty and peremptory Style, which he assumed in writing to them, sufficiently shew that he looked upon them as infinitely below him, as bound to yield a blind Obedience to all his Commands, and submit, without Reply, to all his Decisions: and it is not to be doubted but, had he lived

g Cassian. incar. l. 1. c. 4. h Bar. ad ann. 418. n. 72.

(A) He is said to have been buried near the Body of St. *Laurence*, on the *Tiburtine* Way, on the 25th or 26th of *December*, according to *Anastasius* the *Bibliothecarian* (1); but on the 27th, according to an antient Pontifical, which agrees better with the Letters of *Symmachus* concerning the Election of his Successor *Boniface*: so that he may have governed One Year Nine Months and Eight or Nine Days, which is the Time that *Prosper* allows him (2).

(1) Anast. c. 42. (2) Vide Pontaci not. in chron. Prosp. p. 777.

longer,

longer, and not met with the vigorous Oppoſition which he did from the Biſhop of *Marſeilles*, he would have made great Progreſs toward reducing his *Fellow-Miniſters* and *Fellow-Labourers*, as they are ſtyled by St. *Cyprian*, to that State of Dependence, not to ſay Slavery, which in the End they have been reduced to by his Succeſſors. He was the firſt who made uſe of the Expreſſion, *for ſo it has pleaſed the Apoſtolic See* [l]; an Expreſſion which his Succeſſors have all adopted, as the Language of the higheſt Authority, and ſuch as exempted them from giving any Account either of their Actions, or of the Motives, that prompted them ſo to act. But, to paint *Zoſimus* to the Life, we want no other Colours than thoſe, which the *African* Biſhops, who were but too well acquainted with him, have furniſhed us with in the Letter which they wrote to his Succeſſor *Boniface*. *We hope*, ſay they, *that ſince it has pleaſed the Almighty to raiſe you to the Throne of the* Roman *Church, we ſhall no longer feel the Effects of that worldly Pride and Arrogance, which ought never to have found room in the Church of Chriſt* [m]. In the ſame Letter they complain of their having been made to endure ſuch things as it was almoſt impoſſible for them to endure, which however they were willing to forget. Hard indeed and tyrannical muſt the Treatment have been, which they met with at the Hands of *Zoſimus*, ſince it could extort from ſo many venerable Prelates a Complaint of this Nature, and that in a Letter to his immediate Succeſſor. *Zoſimus* however has been ſainted, and is now worſhiped by the Church of *Rome* as a great Saint, not ſo much in Regard of his own Merits, as by a Blunder of *Baronius* in reviſing and correcting the *Roman* Martyrology. The Caſe is pretty ſingular, and may not be thought quite unworthy of a Place here, by reaſon of the Conſequences, which every Proteſtant Reader may draw from it. In the Martyrology of *Bede* was marked, *St.* Zoſimus *Martyr, who ſuffered for the Confeſſion of the Faith.* This Martyr an ignorant Tranſcriber miſtook for the Pope of the ſame Name, and concerned to find ſo little ſaid of ſo great a Saint, ſet down all he knew of him. This Copy *Baronius* peruſed, and reading there what the Tranſcriber had added of his own, concluded the Saint mentioned in that Place to be Pope *Zoſimus*, and accordingly, upon the ſuppoſed Authority of *Bede*, allotted him a Place among the other Saints in the *Roman* Martyrology. As for his being ſaid to have ſuffered Martyrdom for the Confeſſion of the Faith, *Baronius* aſcribed that to the Ignorance of

Zoſimus *ſainted by a Miſtake of* Baronius.

[l] Conc. t. 2. p. 1567. [m] Conc. t. 2. p. 1141.

the

the Tranſcriber, making but one Saint out of two, though they lived at ſo great a Diſtance of time from each other; for the Martyr lived in the earlieſt Times, and is mentioned by St. *Polycarp*, who flouriſhed Two hundred Years and upwards before the Pontificate of *Zoſimus*. To this double Blunder of the Tranſcriber and *Baronius* is *Zoſimus* indebted for the Worſhip and Honours that are publicly paid him in the Church of *Rome*. Indeed that Church is not more groſly deluded in paying an idolatrous Worſhip to Saints, upon the Authority of her *infallible Guide*, than in the Objects to whom that Worſhip is paid (A).

HONORIUS, **BONIFACE,** THEODOSIUS *the younger.*

Forty-firſt BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 419. *Schiſm in the Church of* Rome.

ZOSIMUS being dead, great Diſturbances aroſe about the Election of his Succeſſor. *Eulalius*, whom Authors diſtinguiſh with the Title of Archdeacon, ſhutting himſelf up in the *Lateran* with Part of the People, and ſome Presbyters and Deacons, was there choſen by them in the room of *Zoſimus*. At the ſame time a great Number of the People, many Presbyters, and ſome Biſhops, aſſembling in the Church of St. *Theodora*, named the Presbyter *Boniface* to the vacant See. Both were ordained the ſame Day they were choſen; *Boniface*, by Nine Biſhops, and in the Preſence of Seventy Presbyters; *Eulalius*, by Three Biſhops only, and in the Preſence of a very ſmall Number of Presbyters; but the Biſhop of *Oſtia* was one of the Three; and he claimed, from a Cuſtom which had long obtained, the Right of ordaining the Biſhop of *Rome*. *Symmachus*, Governor of the City, did all

Boniface *and* Eulalius *both choſen.*

(A) *Bollandus*, to ſaint *Zoſimus* in a more honourable Way, ſuppoſes him to have once had a Place in the Martyrology of St. *Jerom*; and complains of thoſe who have taken the Liberty to ſtrike out his Name. One would think he had found his Name in ſome Copy of that Martyrology, or at leaſt heard of it; but he ingenuouſly owns, that he never found it there himſelf, nor heard of any who did; adding, that nevertheleſs he is fully perſuaded it was once there, and that he cannot think otherwiſe; and it is upon his *not being able to think otherwiſe* that he founds his Suppoſition, his Complaints, and the Saintſhip of *Zoſimus* (1); which is allowing them to have no Foundation at all.

(1) Boll. conat. ad chronol. Pont. p. 61, 62.

that

that lay in his Power to prevent this double Election; but not ſucceeding therein, he immediately diſpatched an Expreſs to the Emperor *Honorius*, then at *Ravenna*, with a Letter dated the 29th of *December* 418. acquainting him with what had paſſed. But his Account was not impartial: he repreſented *Eulalius* as lawfully choſen, and his Competitor as an Uſurper. *Honorius* therefore, by a Reſcript dated the 2d of *January* 419. ordered him to perſuade *Boniface* to retire from *Rome*, to uſe Force, if Perſuaſions did not prevail, and to apprehend and puniſh the Ringleaders of the Sedition, if any ſhould be raiſed on that Occaſion. With this Reſcript the Emperor diſpatched *Aphrodiſius* a Tribune and Notary; and *Symmachus* having received it on the 6th of *January*, ſent early next Morning to *Primiſcrinius*, or firſt Secretary, with an Order for *Boniface* to attend him, and hear what he had to impart to him in the Emperor's Name, letting him know in the mean time that he muſt not take upon him to exerciſe any Epiſcopal Functions; for ſuch was the Will and Pleaſure of the Emperor. This Order *Boniface* received while he was holding an Aſſembly in the Church of St. *Paul* without the Walls, but paid no Regard to it; nay, thoſe who attended him, falling on the Secretary, who brought it, treated him very roughly, which *Symmachus* no ſooner knew than he cauſed the Gates of the City to be ſhut, and kept *Boniface* out. In the mean time *Eulalius*, improving to his Advantage the Abſence of his Competitor, repaired to the Church of St. *Peter*, took Poſſeſſion of it amidſt the loud Acclamations of his Partiſans, and exerciſed there all Epiſcopal Functions.

The Grvernor of Rome *and the Emperor favour* Eulalius,

who takes Poſſeſſion of the Church of St. Peter.

The avowed Partiality of *Symmachus* for *Eulalius* left no room to doubt but he had miſinformed the Emperor. The Biſhops therefore, with the Presbyters and People, who had choſen *Boniface*, thought it their Duty to tranſmit to him a candid and impartial Account of the late Tranſactions: and this they did accordingly, intreating the Emperor at the ſame time to revoke his former Order, and to ſummon both *Eulalius* and *Boniface* to Court, in order to try their Cauſe there. Their Requeſt appeared juſt; and *Honorius*, in Compliance with it, ſent an Order to *Symmachus*, dated the 13th of *January* 419. commanding him to ſuſpend the Execution of his former Order, and to notify to the Two Competitors, that they, and thoſe who ordained them, muſt repair to *Ravenna*, on pain to him who ſhould fail to appear there on the 8th of the enſuing *February*, of having his Election declared null. Several Biſhops were ſummoned to attend at the ſame

The Friends of Boniface *write to the Emperor,*

who ſummon a Council to decide the Controverſy.

time, *Honorius* thinking it proper that a Diſpute of that Nature ſhould be decided by none but Biſhops. However, to remove all Suſpicion of Partiality on his Side, he would not allow thoſe to ſit as Judges, who had been any-ways concerned in the Election or Ordination of either of the Competitors. The Biſhops met, but not being able to agree among themſelves, *Honorius* thought the Affair of ſuch Importance, that he put it off to the 13th of *June*, with a Deſign to have it decided then in a full Council. He wrote accordingly not only to the Biſhops of *Italy*, but to thoſe too of *Gaul* and *Africa*, inviting them to the Council, and acquainting them with the Time and Place of its meeting. In the mean while he ſtrictly injoined both *Boniface* and *Eulalius* to keep at a Diſtance from the City, leſt their Preſence ſhould occaſion Diſturbances there. But as *Eaſter* approached, he appointed *Achilleus* Biſhop of *Spoleti*, who was of neither Party, to perform the Epiſcopal Functions at *Rome* during that Solemnity. This *Eulalius* could not brook; and therefore returning to *Rome*, in open Defiance of the Emperor's Orders, he aſſembled the People, ſeized on the *Lateran*, and, ſhutting the Doors againſt *Achilleus*, performed in that Baſilic the Epiſcopal Functions uſual at *Eaſter*. The Emperor, being acquainted by *Symmachus* with what had paſſed, was ſo provoked at his Diſobedience and Temerity, that, by a Reſcript dated from *Ravenna* the 3d of *April*, and received at *Rome* on the 8th of the ſame Month, he commanded *Symmachus* to drive *Eulalius* from the City, and to put *Boniface* in Poſſeſſion of the diſputed See; which was accordingly done (A).

A more full Council ſummoned.

Eulalius *diſobeys the Emperor, and is driven from* Rome.

Bonaface *indebted to the Emperor for his Dignity.*

Thus was an End put to the Schiſm; thus was *Boniface* placed on the *Roman* See, and veſted with the Papal Dignity by the *Clemency of the Emperor*, as *Largus* Proconſul of *Africa* expreſſes it in his Letter to the Biſhops of that Province [p]; and not by the Authority of a Council conſiſting of Two hundred and Fifty-two Biſhops, which ſome have brought down from the Clouds, without even letting us know where or when they aſſembled [q].

All we know of *Boniface* before his Election is, that he was the Son of one *Jucundus* a Presbyter [r], was ſtricken in Years, well verſed in the Eccleſiaſtical Laws, of an unblemiſhed Character; and, what

[p] Bar. ib. n. 37. [q] Vid. Bar. ib. n. 34. & Baillet. vies de ſaints. 25 Oct. [r] Platina in Bon.

(A) The original Copies of the Letters from *Symmachus* to the Emperor, and of the Emperor's Reſcripts to *Symmachus*, giving a full and diſtinct Account of the preſent Schiſm, are lodged in the *Vatican* Library, and have been thence copied by *Baronius* (1).

(1) Bar. ad ann. 419. n. 1—42.

inhances

enhances his Merit, choſen againſt his Will. Thus ſay his Friends, in the Letter which they wrote in his Behalf to the Emperor *Honorius* [s]. His firſt Care, after he found himſelf in the quiet Poſſeſſion of his See, was to prevent for the future, ſo far as in him lay, the Cabals and Intrigues that might be formed at other Elections, as they had been at his, to the great Diſturbance of the City, and Scandal of the Chriſtian Religion. With this View he wrote to the Emperor, intreating him to reſtrain, by ſome ſevere Law, the Ambition of thoſe who, truſting more to their Intrigues than their Merit, aſpired to a Dignity that was due to Merit alone (A).

Boniface *applies to the Emperor for a Law to reſtrain the Ambition of the Candidates to the Papacy.*

The Emperor, in Compliance with ſo juſt a Demand, enacted a Law, well calculated to prevent effectually the Evil complained of, and keep the Ambition of the Candidates to the Papacy within due Bounds. For by this Law, when Two Perſons were choſen, neither was to hold the Dignity, but the People and Clergy were to proceed to a new Election. This is the firſt Inſtance, that occurs in Hiſtory, of Princes intermeddling in the Election of the Pope; an Evil, ſays F. *Pagi*, which, from ſmall Beginnings, grew to ſuch a Height as to reflect great Shame and Diſgrace on the *Roman* Church [t]. But it muſt be obſerved, that the original Evil was the Corruption, the Violence, and the many Diſorders which the Clergy and People were guilty of in thoſe Elections. It was this which, at the Requeſt of the Pope himſelf, called on the Emperors to interpoſe their Authority, as the only adequate Remedy to ſuch Abuſes. The ſucceeding Emperors followed the Example of *Honorius*, and the *Gothic* as well as the *Lombard* Kings, the Example of the Emperors, as we ſhall ſee in the Sequel of the preſent Hiſtory.

His Law for that Purpoſe.

Boniface was naturally a Lover of Peace, and an Enemy to all Strife and Contention. He did not claim, nor attempt to uſurp, any new Power over his Collegues; but yet he would not part with any his Predeceſſors enjoyed, by what means ſoever they had acquired it; and thoſe who attempted to curtail the uſurped Juriſdiction of the Apoſtolic See, met with as vigorous an Oppoſition from him as they could have done either from *Innocent* or *Zoſimus*. In ſhort, he had not Ambition enough to inlarge his Authority, but thought himſelf in Conſcience obliged *to maintain the juſt Rights*, as he ſtyled and

Boniface *free from Ambition.*

[s] Apud Bar. ann. 419. n. 8. [t] Pagi, crit. hiſt. in annal. Bar.

(A) This Letter bears Date the Firſt of *July* 419.

believed them, *of the See in which it had pleaſed Divine Providence to place him, though unworthy of ſo great an Honour.* His Steadineſs in aſſerting theſe Claims appeared chiefly in the Diſpute that aroſe between him and the Biſhops of *Illyricum*, over whom *Damaſus* had uſurped, as I have related elſewhere [u], and his Succeſſors maintained a particular Power and Juriſdiction. The Tranſaction is thus related by the Writers of thoſe Times. The See of *Patræ* in *Achaia*, one of the Provinces of *Illyricum*, being vacant, the Biſhop of *Corinth*, Metropolitan of that Province, did all that lay in his Power to get *Perigenes*, a Presbyter of an exceptionable Character, choſen in the room of their deceaſed Biſhop. But his Endeavours proving unſucceſsful, he returned to *Corinth*, and died ſoon after. Upon his Death the People and Clergy of *Corinth*, to honour his Memory, and ſhew the Regard they had for one whom he had favoured, unanimouſly named *Perigenes* to ſucceed him. But as they apprehended ſome Oppoſition from the Biſhops of the ſame Province, they wrote to *Boniface*, begging him to confirm their Election with his Authority. *Boniface* referred them to *Rufus*, then Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, and his Vicar in thoſe Parts, declaring that, as for himſelf, he had nothing to object either againſt their Election, or the Perſon elected. *Rufus* notified to the Biſhops of the Province, and the Metropolitans of the Diocеſe, the Approbation of *Boniface*, and his own; but it was not received by all in the ſame manner. The greater Part indeed agreed to the Ordination of the new Biſhop; but ſome oppoſed it with great Warmth, prompted, moſt probably, by the Jealouſy they entertained of the growing Power of the See of *Rome*: for, at their Requeſt, a Law was publiſhed by the Emperor *Theodoſius*, dated the 14th of *July* 421. commanding all Diſputes, that ſhould ariſe in the Dioceſe of *Illyricum*, to be finally determined by the Biſhops of that Dioceſe, after they had conſulted the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* [w]. This was taking thoſe Provinces from the Biſhop of *Rome*, and, in ſome Degree, ſubjecting them to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, or at leaſt, opening a Door for ſuch a Subjection. The Power of the Biſhops of *Conſtantinople* was already grown very conſiderable, and their Ambition keeping Pace with that of the Biſhops of *Rome*, neither let any Opportunity ſlip of extending the Juriſdiction of their own See at the Expence of the other. In the preſent

Diſpute between him and the Biſhops of Illyricum.

Law of Theodoſius concerning Diſputes that ſhould ariſe in Illyricum.

[u] See p. 226, 227.

[w] Cod. Theod. l. 45. de Epiſcop. l. 6.

Caſe

Caſe the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* availing himſelf of the Favour of the Emperor, and the Diſagreement that reigned among the *Illyrican* Biſhops, ſummoned, without Loſs of Time, a Council to meet at *Corinth*, and there to examine the Ordination of *Perigenes*, though he had been ordained, and his Ordination approved of both by *Rufus* and *Boniface*. This Step, quite unexpected, alarmed *Boniface*; he diveſted himſelf at once of his pacific Diſpoſition, and, aſſuming the Air and Style of Authority, he wrote Three Letters, all dated the ſame Day, *viz.* 11th of *March* 422. encouraging the Friends of the Apoſtolic See to maintain its Rights, and threatening thoſe who dared to invade them. The firſt was to *Rufus* of *Theſſalonica*, whom he animates not to ſuffer any Innovations, but vigorouſly to withſtand thoſe, who aſſumed an Authority that did not become them, and to which they had no kind of Title or Claim, meaning, no doubt, the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. The Second Letter he wrote to the Biſhops of *Theſſaly*, exhorting them to acknowlege the Authority of *Rufus*, and no other. The Third was addreſſed to the Biſhops of *Macedon*, *Achaia*, *Theſſaly*, *Epirus*, and *Dacia*, who had been ſummoned by the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* to aſſemble at *Corinth*, and there deliver their Opinion concerning the Ordination of *Perigenes*. In this Letter he complains, in the ſtrongeſt Terms, of ſo bold and daring an Attempt, asking, in the Style of a Sovereign, *What Biſhop ſhall preſume to queſtion an Ordination approved by us? What Biſhop could take upon him to aſſemble a Council with that View and Intent? Read*, he adds, *read the Canons, and there you will find, that the See of* Rome *is the Firſt, the See of* Alexandria *the Second, and that of* Antioch *the Third. Theſe are the Three great Sees; theſe the Sees which the Fathers have diſtinguiſhed above the reſt, with ample Privileges, and extenſive Juriſdiction.* Since he refers them to the Canons to ſhew, that theſe Three Sees are ſuperior to the See of *Conſtantinople*, both in Dignity and Juriſdiction, it were to be wiſhed he had, at the ſame time, acquainted them by what Canons his Predeceſſors had exerciſed over the Provinces of *Illyricum*, the Juriſdiction which he now ſo zealouſly aſſerts. But that is more than it was in his Power to do. However, in the preſent Letter, he threatens with Excommunication ſuch of the *Illyrican* Biſhops as ſhall, in Defiance of his Orders, comply with the Summons which they have received, or preſume to queſtion the Ordination of *Perigenes*. What was the Iſſue of this Diſpute is not recorded by any of the Antients;

Three Letters of Boniface.

He maintains, with Authority, his pretended Rights.

tients; but a modern Historian [x] informs us, that the Emperor *Honorius* interposing, at the Request of *Boniface*, in Behalf of the See of *Rome*, prevailed upon *Theodosius* to revoke his former Law, and enact another in its room, confirming to the Apostolic See all its antient Privileges, and injoining the *Præfectus Prætorio* to see the latter Law put in Execution. The Historian quotes this Law from the Archives of the *Roman* Church. But as it is not to be found either in the *Theodosian* or the *Justinian* Code, its Authenticity may be justly suspected.

He revokes the Privileges granted by Zosimus to the Church of Arles.

The same Year 422. *Boniface* gave a signal Instance of his Equity and Love of Justice, which redounds greatly to his Honour, and therefore ought not to be omitted. He was sensible, that his Predecessor *Zosimus*, abusing his Authority, had acted in the Affair of the *Gallican* Bishops, in a most partial and arbitrary manner; that the See of *Arles* had no just Title to the many Privileges, which he had been induced, by his Partiality for *Patroclus*, to heap on it, at the Expence of Two other Sees; and, consequently, that it was incumbent upon himself, now that he had the Power in his Hands, to rectify by a better Use of it, what his Predecessor had done amiss. The Love of Justice therefore prevailing in him over all other Considerations, he annulled, by a Letter addressed to *Hilarius* of *Narbonne*, whatever had been done by *Zosimus* in favour of the See of *Arles*, restored and confirmed to the Sees of *Narbonne* and *Vienne* all the Rights and Privileges, which they had been so unjustly divested of, and declaring all the Grants and Concessions made to the See of *Arles* repugnant to the Canons, strictly injoined the Bishop of *Narbonne* not to suffer his Brother of *Arles* to exercise, in virtue of them, any kind of Authority within the Limits of his Jurisdiction (A). The Conduct of *Boniface* was afterwards approved, and that of *Zosimus* justly condemned, by Pope *Leo the Great*, declaring in a Letter which he wrote to the Bishops of the Province of *Vienne*, that the Privileges, which the Apostolic See had granted to *Patroclus*, were afterwards revoked *by a more equitable Sentence*.

A remarkable Instance of his Moderation.

One of the many Artifices, employed by the Popes to aggrandize their See, was to raise Divisions among their Collegues, or to foment underhand those that others had raised. For in such Divisions they

[x] Fleury hist. eccles. l. 24. n. 31.

(A) This Letter is dated the 2d of *February* 422.

never

never ſtood neuter, but, taking Part in the Quarrel, nay, and making themſelves Principals, they warmly declared in favour of one Party againſt the other, that, by ſupporting them, they might be in their Turn ſupported by them in all their Pretenſions. To this worldly Wiſdom, this wicked Policy, *Boniface* was an utter Stranger: for he did not lay hold of a very favourable Opportunity, which the Diviſion, that reigned at this time among the Biſhops of *Gaul*, offered him, to improve his Authority, and extend his Juriſdiction. The Metropolitan Dignity was diſputed there by the Biſhops of *Vienne*, of *Narbonne*, and of *Arles*, as I have obſerved above. During that Conteſt the Clergy of *Valence*, quarreling with their Biſhop *Maximus*, charged him with ſeveral Crimes; but not caring to accuſe him at the Tribunal of any of the Three Competitors (for that had been acknowleging, in one of the Three, the Metropolitan Juriſdiction then in Diſpute), they arraigned him at *Rome*, and ſummoned him to plead his Cauſe there before *Boniface*. Moſt other Popes would have eagerly embraced ſuch an Opportunity of inlarging their Power; nay, and founded upon this particular Caſe the general Right of judging, and finally determining, all Cauſes of the like Nature. But *Boniface* declared, in his Letter to *Patroclus*, and the other Biſhops of the Seven Provinces of *Gaul*, that though *Maximus* had been accuſed at his Tribunal, though he had not appeared to clear himſelf from the Crimes laid to his Charge, and might thereupon be thought guilty, and be juſtly condemned; yet he would not take upon him to pronounce ſuch a Sentence, becauſe that Biſhop *ought, according to the Canons, to be judged, and condemned, or abſolved, in his own Province.* An Inſtance of Moderation that reflects no ſmall Honour on the Memory of *Boniface*; the rather as he had before his Eyes the recent Examples of *Innocent* and *Zoſimus*, the Two moſt ambitious and arrogant Popes the Church had yet ſeen. He cloſes his Letter with exhorting the Biſhops of the Seven Provinces to aſſemble againſt the Firſt of *November*, that *Maximus* may be cleared, if innocent, or condemned, if guilty.

Boniface died on the 4th of *November* 422. having held the Chair 3 Years, 9 Months, and ſome Days. He was buried in the Cœmetery of the Martyr St. *Felicitas*, on the *Salarian* Way; where he is ſaid to have built an Oratory. He is worſhiped by the Church of *Rome* among her Saints, an Honour which few of his Predeceſſors better deſerved. But it is a Wonder that the laſt Inſtance I have given of *His Death.*

his

his Moderation, and Regard to the Canons against the Claims of his See, did not exclude him out of the Calendar. His Festival is kept on the 25th of *October*; and *Bede* quotes a Book of Miracles wrought by Pope *Boniface* [y]; but whether by the First Pope of that Name, or the Second, he does not inform us, though he seems to give an intire Credit to every idle Tale that Legend contained. And here I cannot help observing, by the way, that the less necessary Miracles became the more they were multiplied. In *Bede*'s Time, and the three preceding Centuries, Men were rather inclined to believe too much than too little; and yet in no other Time was there a greater Profusion of Miracles. From an antient Epitaph quoted by *Baronius* [z], it appears that *Boniface* died very old; that he had served the Church from his tender Years; that by his engaging Behaviour he put an End to the Schism, and that he relieved *Rome* in the time of a Famine.

HONORIUS, **CELESTINE**, THEODOSIUS II. VALENTINIAN III.

Forty-second BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 422. Celestine *chosen without Opposition.*

UPON the Demise of *Boniface*, *Celestine* was chosen in his room, without the least Disturbance or Opposition. *Eulalius* indeed, who was still alive, and led a retired Life in the neighbouring Province of *Campania*, was tempted by his Friends in *Rome* to try his Fortune a Second Time; but he did not chuse to quit his Solitude, and involve both himself and them in new Troubles. *Celestine* was a Native of *Rome*, the Son of one *Priscus*, and a Deacon, if not a Presbyter, at the Time of his Election [a].

Antony, *one of St.* Austin's *Disciples, appointed by his Interest Bishop of* Fussala.

He was scarce warm in the Chair, when he received a Letter from St. *Austin* on the following Occasion. As the small Town, or rather Village, of *Fussala*, belonging to the Bishoprick of *Hippo*, the See of St. *Austin*, stood at a great Distance from that City, the good Bishop thought he could not better consult the spiritual Welfare of the Inhabitants, who had but very lately abandoned the Party of the *Donatists*, than by causing their Town to be erected into a separate Bishoprick,

[y] Bed. in collectan. in fin. hist. Pel. l. 2. c. 10. [z] Bar. ad ann. 423. n. 8, 9. [a] Vid. Noris

and

and letting them have a Biſhop of their own. This was indeed abridging both his own Juriſdiction and Revenues; but as he had the Good of the People more at Heart than either, he purſued his Scheme with Succeſs, and prevailed upon his Collegues in *Numidia* to ordain a young Man named *Antony*, whom he had brought up from his Infancy, the firſt Biſhop of the Place, though at that time only a Reader. This Promotion, *per ſaltum*, as it is ſtyled, was ſtrictly forbidden by the Popes in their Decretals; but to their Orders St. *Auſtin* paid no greater Regard than the other Biſhops did, though he always ſpoke of them, and to them, with all the Reſpect that was due to the firſt Biſhop in the Weſt. St. *Auſtin* had ſoon Occaſion to repent his tranſgreſſing thoſe Regulations, which, it muſt be owned, are in themſelves very wiſe: for *Antony*, who was but a Youth, and had been kept by St. *Auſtin* under great Reſtraint, no ſooner found himſelf free from all Controul, than abandoning himſelf intirely to the Indulgence of his youthful Paſſions, he thereby ſcandalized the new Catholics to ſuch a Degree, that they let St. *Auſtin* know the Conduct of their Biſhop, unleſs he was quickly removed, would certainly drive them to the laſt Extremity; meaning, perhaps, that they ſhould be forced either to put him to Death, or to join anew the *Donatiſts*, whom they had but lately forſaken. Such Menaces alarmed St. *Auſtin* no leſs than the Conduct of his Favourite Diſciple ſurpriſed him. A Council was immediately ſummoned at his Requeſt by the Primate of *Numidia*; *Antony* was ordered to attend it, and the Inhabitants of *Fuſſala* invited to lay their Complaints before the Aſſembly. The Summons was complied with by all, and *Antony*, by a great Number of Witneſſes, convicted of Rapine, Violence, and Extortion. But, becauſe ſome capital Crimes laid to his Charge were not ſufficiently proved, the Fathers of the Council, out of an unſeaſonable Compaſſion, contented themſelves with only condemning him to reſtore to the Inhabitants of *Fuſſala* what he had with Violence taken from them. They were even inclined to leave him in the quiet Poſſeſſion of his Church; but that being warmly oppoſed by the People, they deprived him of the Adminiſtration, and of all Juriſdiction; but as he ſtill retained the Epiſcopal Dignity, they did not chuſe to remove him to another City to live there even as a private Perſon, leſt they ſhould be thought to tranſgreſs the Rules of the Fathers forbidding Tranſlations [c]. None could think ſo who were the leaſt acquainted with thoſe Rules.

Antony's ſcandalous Behaviour.

He is deprived of the Adminiſtration, and all Juriſdiction, by a Council.

[c] Aug. ep. 261. de civ. Dei, l. 22. c. 8.

He appeals to Rome.

Antony satisfied, pursuant to his Sentence, the Inhabitants of *Fussala*, whom he had wronged. But pretending that he had been unjustly deprived of his Bishoprick, he resolved to appeal to *Rome*. He was sensible that his appealing at this Juncture, when the Point of Appeals was warmly disputed, as I shall relate hereafter, was Merit enough to recommend him to the Favour of that See. However, not trusting to that alone, as *Boniface* was still alive, he first engaged in his Favour his own Primate, the Primate of *Numidia*, who, having been excused on Account of his great Age from assisting at the Council, was not well acquainted with what had passed there. Him therefore he easily

Prevails upon the Primate to write in his Behalf to Rome.

persuaded, that he had been very ill used by the Council: *For had they thought me guilty*, said he, *of the Rapine and Extortions, that were laid to my Charge, they ought, and, without all doubt, would have deposed me: they have not deposed me, and therefore did not, as is manifest, think me guilty. If I did not deserve to be degraded from my Dignity, I did not deserve to be driven from my See.* Thus he artfully turned the Mercy that had been shewn him against those who had shewn it; and, having by that means imposed upon the Primate, persuaded him to write a Letter in his Behalf to *Boniface*. With

How received by Boniface.

this Letter he repaired to *Rome*, but did not meet there with the Reception he expected: for all he could obtain of *Boniface* was a Letter to the Bishops of *Numidia*, requiring them to reinstate him in his See, *provided he had represented Matters as they truly were.* This conditional Request *Antony*, on his Return to *Africa*, improved, it seems into an absolute Command: for he threatened the People of *Fussala* with a Visit from the Imperial Troops and Commissaries, if they did not receive him as their lawful Bishop, in compliance with the Orders of the Apostolic See [d]. In the mean time *Boniface* dying, and *Ce-*

The People of Fussala *write against him to* Innocent.

lestine being chosen in his room, the People of *Fussala* apprehending, as St. *Austin* writes, greater Evils from a Catholic Bishop, after their Return to the Church, than they had done from a Catholic Emperor during their Separation, wrote a most pathetic Letter to the new Pope, intreating him to pity their Condition, to curb *Antony* in his unchristian Attempts, and to redeem them, by his Authority, from the Calamities which they had Reason to apprehend from that Prelate's Cruelty and Ambition. In the same Letter they imputed all their Misfortunes to *Austin*, who had set over them such a Bishop. And this *Austin*

[d] Aug. ep. 261.

was

was ſo far from taking amiſs, that he owned the Charge, and even backed their Requeſt with a Letter of his own, conjuring *Celeſtine*, by the Memory of St. *Peter, who abhorred all Violence and Tyranny*, not to uſe either with the People of *Fuſſala*, who, he ſaid, had but too much Reaſon not to ſubmit tamely to the galling Yoke from which they had been ſo lately delivered. He adds, that if, in ſpite of all his Endeavours and Remonſtrances, he ſhould ſtill have the Mortification to ſee the Church of *Fuſſala* plundered and tyrannically oppreſſed by one whom he had raiſed to that See, he ſhould think himſelf obliged to atone for the Share which he had in his Crimes, by reſigning his own [e]. *Celeſtine* was ſo affected with theſe Letters, that he immediately acquieſced to the Sentence of the Council of *Numidia*; and the new Biſhopric of *Fuſſala* being ſuppreſſed, that Town, with its Diſtrict, was again ſubjected to the See of *Hippo*. From theſe Letters, that were written by the *Africans* on this Occaſion, it appears, that the Biſhops of *Rome* uſed, in thoſe Days, to ſend ſome of their Eccleſiaſtics into *Africa*, to ſee the Sentences, which they had given, executed there; and that thoſe Eccleſiaſtics came with Orders from the Court for the Civil Magiſtrates to aſſiſt them, where their Aſſiſtance ſhould be required, or thought neceſſary.

Are ſeconded by St. Auſtin.

Celeſtine *acquieſces to the Sentence of the Council of* Numidia.

The Schiſm formed by *Eulalius* was not, it ſeems, yet quite extinct in *Rome* in the Year 425. for I find a Law of that Year, dated the 17th of *July*, and addreſſed to *Fauſtus* Prefect of the City, commanding all *Manichees*, Heretics, Schiſmatics, and Sects of every Denomination, to be driven out of *Rome*; but more eſpecially thoſe, who, ſeparating themſelves from the Communion of the *Venerable Pope*, kept alive a dangerous Schiſm. Over theſe *Fauſtus* is injoined to keep a watchful Eye, to ſummon them to communicate with *Celeſtine*, and, if they did not comply with the Summons in Twenty Days, to baniſh them a Hundred Miles from *Rome* [f]. This Law was iſſued by *Placidia*, who, upon the Death of her Brother *Honorius*, which happened in the Month of *Auguſt* 423. and that of the Uſurper *John*, killed in 425. governed the Weſtern Empire, as Guardian to her Son *Valentinian* III. The Law ſhe iſſued, probably put an End to the Schiſm; for no further mention is made of it by any Hiſtorian.

An End put to the Schiſm formed by Eulalius.

[e] Aug. ibid. [f] Cod. Theod. t. 5. p. 134.

It was in the Time of *Celestine*, and the following Year 426. the Fourth of his Pontificate, that the Bishops of *Africa*, quite tired out with the daily Encroachments of the Bishops of *Rome*, and not able to brook the despotic and arbitrary Power which they had begun to exercise over them, took the no less laudable than necessary Resolution of breaking their Chains before they were thoroughly rivetted, and asserting their antient Liberty, by effectually removing what had endangered it, the pernicious Abuse of appealing to *Rome*.

Apiarius, a Presbyter of Sicca, appeals to Rome.

The Incident which gave Occasion to that Resolution was, the Appeal of a Presbyter of *Sicca*, named *Apiarius*, who, being convicted of many Crimes, and thereupon degraded and excommunicated by his own Bishop *Urbanus*, appealed to *Zosimus* then Bishop of *Rome*.

Zosimus restores him to the Rank from which he had been degraded.

Zosimus, who missed no Opportunity of acquiring new Power, or improving the Power which he had acquired, not only received the Appeal, but, without ever hearing the other Side, restored *Apiarius* both to his Rank, and the Communion of the Church. This was the boldest Attempt that had yet been made upon the Rights and Liberties of the *African* Churches; and therefore the Bishops in those Parts, all uniting in a Cause that was common to all, loudly complained of such an arbitrary Act, as an open Violation of the Canons of the Church; forbidding those, who had been excluded from the Communion by their own Bishop, to be admitted to it by any other g. *Zosimus*, finding the *African* Bishops had taken the Alarm, and were determined to restrain his Power within the Limits prescribed to it by the Canons, and, on the other hand, being well apprised, that he could allege no Canons, that had ever been received by them, to countenance the Power which he claimed, and had exercised, thought it would be no great Crime to recur to Fraud on so urgent an Occasion. Agreeably to this Scheme, he caused Two Canons to be transcribed from the Council of *Sardica*; the one allowing Presbyters and Deacons, when rashly excommunicated by their own Bishops, to appeal to the neighbouring Bishops; and the other, authorizing the Appeal of all Bishops to the Bishop of *Rome*. Had the *Africans* received these Canons, he intended to have justified, by the former, his judging and absolving *Apiarius*, notwithstanding the Distance between *Rome* and *Numidia*; and, in virtue of the latter, to get the Canon revoked, which the *African* Bishops had lately made, for-

To support his Pretensions, endeavours to impose upon the African *Bishops the Canons of* Sardica *for the Canons of* Nice.

g Concil. t. 2. p. 1048. Bar. ad ann. 419. n. 60.

bidding,

bidding, on Pain of Excommunication, Appeals *beyond Sea*; that is, to *Rome*. Nothing leſs than an intire Subjection of the *African* Churches to the See of *Rome* would ſatisfy the boundleſs Ambition of *Zoſimus*; and ſuch a Subjection would infallibly have enſued, had the Two above-mentioned Canons been received by the *African* Biſhops in the Senſe which *Zoſimus* did, and ſeemed determined to make others, put upon them. But the main Point was, to perſuade the Biſhops of *Africa* to admit ſuch Canons, eſpecially at ſo critical a Juncture. The Council of *Sardica* had never been received there: nay, they were, it ſeems, at this very Time, utter Strangers both to that Council and its Canons; ſo that it was uſeleſs to quote them as ſuch. Of this *Zoſimus* was aware; and therefore, as he ſtuck at nothing that ſtood in the way of his Ambition, he reſolved, by one of the moſt impudent and bare-faced Impoſtures recorded in Hiſtory, to try whether he could not impoſe upon the Biſhops of *Africa* the Canons of *Sardica* for the Canons of *Nice*. With this knaviſh View, and to render the Impoſture more ſolemn, and leſs ſuſpected, he diſpatched into *Africa* Three Legates, *viz.* *Fauſtinus* Biſhop of *Potentia* in *Picenum*, and Two *Roman* Presbyters, *Philippus* and *Aſellus*. Their Inſtructions, contained in a Letter addreſſed to themſelves, were, to require of the *African* Biſhops a ſtrict Obſervance of the Two above-mentioned Canons of *Nice*; to complain of their repairing ſo often to Court; and to deſire them not to communicate with *Urbanus* of *Sicca*, who had depoſed *Apiarius*, or even to ſend him to *Rome*, if he refuſed to correct what he had done amiſs[h]: that is, we may ſuppoſe, if he did not reſtore *Apiarius* to his Rank, and the Communion of the Church.

With this View he ſends a ſolemn Embaſſy into Africa.

With theſe Inſtructions the Legates ſet out for *Africa*, where they no ſooner arrived, than a Council was convened, at which aſſiſted, among the reſt, *Alypius* Biſhop of *Tagaſte*, St. *Auſtin*'s great Friend, and *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*. When the Legates firſt appeared before the Council, the Biſhops deſired them to lay their Inſtructions before the Aſſembly; which they were at firſt unwilling to do, contenting themſelves with declaring their Commiſſion by Word of Mouth. But the *Africans* knowing whom they had to deal with, and thereupon preſſing them to communicate their Inſtructions in Writing, they complied at laſt, and produced the Letter

[h] Concil. t. 2. p. 1137—1144.

The Surprize of the African *Bishops on this Occasion.*

I have mentioned above, which was immediately registred. When it was publicly read, it is impossible to conceive the Surprize and Astonishment that appeared in the whole Assembly. They had never heard of those Canons; and to find them thus confidently ascribed to the Council of *Nice*, was what appeared to them strange beyond Expression. Warm Disputes arose, of which, however, we know no Particulars. Several different *Greek* Copies, several *Latin* Copies, were sent for, and carefully examined and compared; but no such Canons could be found there. However, as the Legates continued to maintain, with an unparalleled Impudence, the disputed Canons of *Nice*, the Council agreed to observe them, till they had, by a more diligent Inquiry, discovered the Truth [i].

A General Council assembled at Carthage.

They continued their Sessions; but as they were few in Number, as the Point in Dispute was of the utmost Consequence, and nearly affected all the Bishops of *Africa*, they thought it should be communicated to all; and that, without the Concurrence of all, no Resolution should be taken. A General Council was accordingly assembled at *Carthage*, consisting of Two hundred and Seventeen Bishops, from the different Provinces of *Africa*. They met, for the first time, on the 25th of *May* 419. *Faustinus* being placed next after *Aurelius* of *Carthage* and *Valentine* Primate of *Numidia*, and the Two Presbyters *Philippus* and *Asellus* after the other Bishops. Being all seated, *Aurelius* moved, that the Canons of *Nice* might be read, from the Copies which they had of that Council in *Africa*. But this was warmly opposed by *Faustinus*, insisting upon their reading, in the first place, his Instructions, and coming to some Resolution concerning the Observance of the Canons of *Nice*, which he was charged by the Apostolic See to require of them. *It matters not*, said he, *whether or no those Canons are to be found in your Copies, or, indeed, in any other. You must know, that the Canons and Ordinances of* Nice, *which have been handed down to us by Tradition, and established by Custom, are no less binding than those that have been conveyed to us in Writing.* To this Speech the Bishops returned no Answer; without doubt, because they thought it deserved none. However, at his Request, his Instructions were read, and warm Debates ensued. *Alypius* was of Opinion, that since the disputed Canons were not to be found in any of their Copies, Messengers and

The Conduct of Faustinus, *the Pope's Legate, on this Occasion.*

The Resolution taken by the Council.

[i] Concil. t. 2. p. 1144—1148.

Letters ſhould be immediately diſpatched to the Biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, for authentic Copies of the Acts and Canons of *Nice*. This Propoſal *Fauſtinus* highly reſented, as an Outrage offered to the Apoſtolic See, which, he ſaid, was thereby arraigned of Fraud and Forgery. He therefore adviſed them to write to *Boniface*, who, by this time, had ſucceeded *Zoſimus*, and, leaving to him the Care of examining the Authority of thoſe Canons, ſubmit the Whole to his Judgment, to his known Prudence and Diſcretion. He added, that, by acting otherwiſe, they might give Occaſion to great Diviſions and Diſturbances in the Church. *Aurelius*, not to exaſperate the Legate, whom he found to be a Man of a haughty, imperious, and intractable Temper, made no other Reply, but *that they would write to* Boniface. St. *Auſtin* promiſed to obſerve thoſe Canons ſo long as it could be reaſonably ſuppoſed that they were the Canons of *Nice*. The other Biſhops made the ſame Promiſe; which was confirming the Reſolution the Council had taken the Year before. Here the Legate exaggerated anew the Affront they offered to the *Roman* Church; adding, that the only Reparation they could make, for queſtioning the Authenticity of Canons propoſed by her, was, to leave the deciding of that Point to her, and acquieſce to her Judgment. But the Warmth, the Earneſtneſs, the Paſſion which he betrayed in his Speech, and in his whole Conduct, ſerved only to heighten the Jealouſy, and confirm the Suſpicions of the *African* Biſhops. It was therefore univerſally agreed, in ſpite of the Remonſtrances, Intreaties, and Menaces of the Legate, that *Aurelius* ſhould write to the Biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, for authentic Copies of the Canons of *Nice*; that if the Canons, quoted by *Fauſtinus*, were found in thoſe Copies, they ſhould be punctually obſerved; if not, that a new Council ſhould be convened, and ſuch Reſolutions taken, as the Fathers, who compoſed it, ſhould think proper [k].

The Affair of Apiarius, *how ſettled by the Council.*

Matters being thus ſettled, with reſpect to the pretended Canons of *Nice*, concerning Appeals, the Council took next into Conſideration the Caſe of *Apiarius*, which had given Occaſion to the preſent Diſpute between *Rome* and *Africa*; and it was agreed, that *Apiarius* ſhould make the due Submiſſion to his Biſhop, and thereupon be re-admitted to his Communion, and reſtored to his Rank. However, as he had given great Offence to the People of *Sicca*, by

[k] Conc. t. 2. p. 1145—1149.

his

his scandalous Life, he was ordered, by the Council, to quit that City; but, at the same time, allowed to exercise the Functions of his Office in any other Place [l]. This Medium the Council wisely chose between the Two opposite Sentences; that of *Urbanus* excommunicating and deposing him, and that of *Zosimus* restoring him to the Communion and the Priesthood. Such was the Issue of the Appeal of *Apiarius:* and I leave the Reader to judge, whether *Baronius* should boast of it as he does. And now nothing remained, but to acquaint *Boniface* with the Acts and Resolutions of the Council; and this was done accordingly by a Letter, which they all signed, and delivered to the Legates. In that Letter they begged *Boniface* to procure, from the East, authentic Copies of the Canons of *Nice*, promising to observe the Canons in Dispute, till such Copies were procured; but this upon Condition, that if those Canons were not found to be genuine, they should recover their antient Privileges, and not be forced to *submit to a Yoke, which Ambition alone could impose* [m].

The African *Bishops write into the East for authentic Copies of the Council of* Nice.

With this Letter the Three Legates set out from *Africa*, on their Return to *Rome*. Upon their Departure, the *African* Bishops wrote, agreeably to the Resolution they had taken, to *Atticus* of *Constantinople* and *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, begging they would cause to be transcribed, and send into *Africa*, the most authentic Copies they had of the Canons of *Nice*. With this Request the Two Bishops readily complied; and the same Year 419. the Messengers sent to *Alexandria* and *Constantinople* returned with the wished-for Copies, and very friendly and obliging Answers, which are still extant [n], from *Cyril* and *Atticus*, addressed *To* Aurelius, *to* Valentine, *and to all the Bishops of* Africa *assembled at* Carthage. As for the Bishop of *Antioch*, the *Africans* probably did not write to him; at least, they had no Answer from him (A). They immediately compared the Two Copies, sent them from the East, with their own, especially with that which *Cæcilianus* of *Carthage* had brought with him from *Nice*, where he had assisted at the Council, and found them agree in every Particular, without any Trace of the Canons that *Zosimus*

The pretended Canons not found in those Copies, and the Dispute dropt by Boniface.

[l] Ibid. p. 1137—1145. [m] Concil. ibid. p. 1137—1141. [n] Concil. t. 2. p. 1144.

(A) It is very observable, that the *Alexandrian* Copy was originally sent from *Rome* by *Marcus* Bishop of that City, upon a Complaint made by the *Egyptian* Bishops, that the *Arians* had burnt all the Copies of the Council of *Nice* that were then found in *Alexandria*.

had produced: upon which they diſpatched the ſame Eccleſiaſtics with them to *Rome*, whom they had ſent into the Eaſt. *Boniface*, who was an Enemy to all Fraud and Impoſition, acquieſced; the Diſpute was dropped; ſo that the Canon, which the *African* Biſhops had lately made, forbidding Appeals to *Rome*, and *Zoſimus* had thus fraudulently attempted to defeat, remained in its full Vigour; and the Churches of *Africa* were ſuffered quietly to enjoy their antient Rights and Privileges, ſo long as *Boniface* lived. But in the Pontificate of his Succeſſor *Celeſtine*, the Storm broke out anew.

The Power of receiving Appeals claimed by the Popes only as granted by the Canons.

It may not be improper here to obſerve, that *Zoſimus*, though wholly bent on exalting his See, and ſtraining every Prerogative to the higheſt Pitch, yet did not preſume to exalt it above the Canons; did not claim the diſputed Power of receiving Appeals, of judging, deciding, *&c.* independently of the Canons. And was not this owning himſelf, but for the Canons, to be upon the Level with the other Biſhops his Collegues; at leaſt in reſpect to this Point? Is not the ſcandalous Method, which he took on this Occaſion to extend his own Power, and curtail that of the *African* Biſhops, a Demonſtration of his deriving his Claim from the Canons alone? Could there ever offer a better Opportunity, could there ever occur a more urgent Neceſſity, of aſſerting a *Divine Right?* As *Zoſimus* therefore never aſſerted, nor even mentioned, ſuch a Right, we may well conclude, that he either had no Notion of it, or did not think it ſufficiently grounded to be of any Uſe in the preſent Diſpute. And yet this *Divine Right* of receiving Appeals from all Parts of the World, of conſtituting, confirming, judging, cenſuring, ſuſpending, depoſing, removing, reſtoring Biſhops, and all other Eccleſiaſtics, is now held, as an Article of Faith, by all true *Roman* Catholics; inſomuch that to diſpute ſuch an Article, would be no leſs dangerous, in Countries where the Inquiſition prevails, than to diſpute any Article of the *Apoſtolic* or *Nicene* Creed. It is true, *Innocent* the Firſt, as the Advocates for the See of *Rome* obſerve, had claimed, by *Divine Right*, the Power of finally deciding all Controverſies. But he himſelf ſeems to have been ſenſible, that he had gone too far. For what elſe could have induced him to reſtrain that Claim, as ſoon as he had ſet it up, to *Matters of Faith alone* [o]? Had *Zoſimus* thought the general Claim capable of being maintained, he needed not have recurred, as he did,

[o] See p. 342.

to

to Fraud and Imposture. The Pretensions of *Innocent*, in their utmost Extent, were indeed renewed, in Process of Time, by his Successors; but not till the intolerable Abuse, which they made of the Power granted them by the Canons of *Sardica*, on which they founded all their Usurpations, obliged other Councils to revoke those Canons; and then it was, that, no other Means being left of maintaining their ill-gotten Power, they revived the Claim of *Innocent*, and challenging no longer by the Canons, but by *Divine Right*, the Prerogative of receiving Appeals, they put it out of the Power of all future Councils to abridge or restrain it.

Whether Zosimus *ignorantly mistook the Canons of* Sardica *for those of* Nice.

The Three Cardinals *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, and *Noris*, thinking the Imputation of Ignorance less injurious to the Memory of *Zosimus*, less derogatory to the Dignity of the Apostolic See, than that of Fraud and Imposture, suppose him to have ignorantly mistaken the Canons of *Sardica* for the Canons of *Nice*; which is supposing, that in the whole Archives of the *Roman* Church there was not a single genuine Copy of the Council of *Nice*, or that *Zosimus* had never perused it; and to suppose either is highly absurd. Besides, the whole Conduct of the Legate, the Pains he took to divert the *African* Bishops from consulting other Copies, and, when he could not prevail, his recurring to *unwritten* Canons; and, as that too proved ineffectual, his striving by all possible means to persuade the *Africans* to leave to the Pope the Care of examining other Copies, and to acquiesce, without any further Inquiry, to what should thereupon be determined by him, plainly shews, that the Legate was privy to the Fraud, and apprehended a Detection.

Apiarius *excommunicated anew.*

He appeals anew to Rome, *and is restored by* Celestine, *and sent back attended by the Legate* Faustinus.

Apiarius, being obliged to quit *Sicca*, as I have related above, retired to *Tabraca*, another City of *Numidia*, and led there so scandalous a Life, that he was excommunicated anew. Hereupon he appealed again to *Rome*, and *Celestine*, which is very surprising, notwithstanding the vigorous Opposition which his Predecessors had, but very lately, met with from the *African* Bishops, in attempting to restore this very Presbyter, not only declared him innocent, and admitted him to his Communion, but sent him back into *Africa*, attended by the Legate *Faustinus*, who was ordered to see him reinstated. The *Africans* were but too well acquainted already with the Presumption and Arrogance of the Bishops of *Rome*; and yet such an insolent Act quite surprised them. For *Celestine* had neither examined the Crimes, which *Apiarius* was charged with, nor heard

the

the Witneſſes, nor even condeſcended to let them know, that he intended to judge him anew. He wrote, indeed, Two Letters to them on this Occaſion, but which ſeemed merely deſigned to inſult them: for, by the Firſt, he gave them Notice of the Arrival of *Apiarius* at *Rome*, which, he ſaid, had given him great Joy; and by the Second, which was brought by *Fauſtinus*, he acquainted them, that he was overjoyed to have found him innocent. From this deſpotic and extraordinary way of acting, the *African* Biſhops concluded, that *Celeſtine* was determined to keep no Meaſures with them, and that nothing leſs than an intire Subjection of the *African* Churches to the See of *Rome* would ſatisfy his Ambition. But they were reſolved to maintain, at all Events, the Liberty wherewith Chriſt had made them free. A general Council was therefore aſſembled, and *Apiarius* ſummoned to attend. He obeyed the Summons, and appeared before the Council at the Time appointed, but, in Company with *Fauſtinus*, ſhewing thereby, that he placed greater Confidence in him than in his own Innocence. *Fauſtinus* ſpoke firſt, and preſſed, with great Warmth, the Fathers of the Aſſembly to re-admit *Apiarius* to their Communion, ſince he had been declared innocent by the Apoſtolic See, and admitted by *Celeſtine* to the Communion of the *Roman* Church. The Biſhops replied, that in *Africa Apiarius* had been found guilty, and that in *Africa* his Innocence muſt be made to appear, before they could receive him again to their Communion. As they ſtuck to this Point, *Fauſtinus* undertook his Cauſe; but, inſtead of proving, as he had promiſed to do, or even attempting to prove his Innocence, he inveighed, from the Beginning of his Speech to the End, and in very harſh and opprobrious Language, againſt the Council, and all the Members, who compoſed it. *Apiarius* was ſenſible, that the Speech of *Fauſtinus* inſtead of reconciling the *African* Biſhops to him, had incenſed them more than ever againſt him; and therefore thinking it adviſeable to take the Cauſe into his own Hands, he ſtood up as ſoon as the other had done; and, with a Modeſty capable, as he thought, of atoning for the Inſolence of *Fauſtinus*, endeavoured to clear himſelf from the Crimes that had been laid to his Charge. When he had ſpoken, the Witneſſes againſt him were heard; and the Trial laſted Three whole Days, *Apiarius* ſtriving, with great Art and Subtilty, to invalidate the Depoſitions, and *Fauſtinus* prompting him when he was at a Stand. He might, perhaps, have eſcaped Condemnation, partly by his own Craft and Addreſs, partly

A general Council aſſembled.

Apiarius *appears before it, with* Fauſtinus.

The Legate's inſolent Conduct.

Apiarius *pleads his own Cauſe.*

Fauſtinus *aſſiſts him.*

by the powerful Protection of the Biſhop of *Rome*, had he been able to withſtand the Stings of his own Conſcience. But, on the Fourth Day, when *Fauſtinus* began to triumph as ſure of Victory, *Apiarius*, ſtruck with ſudden Remorſe, damped at once all his Joy, by voluntarily owning, to the great Surprize of all preſent, and the unſpeakable Confuſion of *Fauſtinus*, every Crime with which he had been charged. Thoſe Crimes the Fathers have thought fit to wrap up in Oblivion; and indeed it was not proper that Poſterity ſhould know them; ſince they were *heinous, incredible, ſuch as ought not to be mentioned, and drew Sighs and Tears from the whole Aſſembly* [p]. And this is the Man whom Two Popes, both now worſhiped as Saints in the Church of *Rome*, abſolved as innocent; and, as innocent, would have ſupported with Force and Violence, had not Providence almoſt miraculouſly interpoſed, to prevent the Evils that would have enſued. They could not but know, that *Apiarius* was guilty, at leaſt they did not know that he was innocent. But as he had been declared guilty in *Africa*, their declaring him innocent, whether he was ſo or not, gave them an Opportunity of renewing the Attempts of the Apoſtolic See on the Liberties of the *African* Churches; and it was, no doubt, with this View that they abſolved and reſtored him. But, as he was not hardened enough in Iniquity for their Purpoſe, he owned himſelf guilty, in ſpite of their Judgment declaring him innocent, and thereby defeated their Schemes for the preſent. For the *Africans*, now ſenſible that there was no Wickedneſs which the Biſhops of *Rome* would not countenance, in order to eſtabliſh their Power in *Africa*, to the utter Subverſion of all Eccleſiaſtical Order and Diſcipline there, thought themſelves bound, as they tendered the Welfare, Peace, and Tranquillity of the Churches committed to their Care, to act with that Vigour and Steadineſs, which ſo urgent an Occaſion ſeemed to require. Accordingly they firſt abſolutely cut off *Apiarius* from the Communion of the Church; then renewed, in ſtronger Terms than ever, the Canon, which had given ſo great Offence at *Rome*, prohibiting, on Pain of Excommunication, Appeals *beyond Sea*, under any Pretence whatſoever; and this Prohibition they extended to Eccleſiaſtics of all Conditions and Ranks. *Fauſtinus* bluſtered, vapoured, threatened; but all in vain. The Biſhops not only ſigned, all to a Man, the above-mentioned Canon, but wrote a Synodal Letter to *Celeſtine*, acquainting him with what had

Apiarius *ſtruck with ſudden Remorſe, owns the Crimes laid to his Charge.*

The African *Biſhops renew the Canon, forbidding Appeals to* Rome.

[p] Concil. t. 2. p. 1145—1148.

paſſed

paſſed in the Caſe of *Apiarius*, and earneſtly intreating him not to give Ear for the future to thoſe, who ſhould have recourſe to him from *Africa*, nor receive to his Communion ſuch as they had excluded from theirs: *For we muſt let your Venerableneſs* (Venerabilitas tua) *know*, ſay they, *that it has been ſo eſtabliſhed by the Council of* Nice. *And though mention is there made of Clerks only, and Laymen; yet there is no room to doubt but it was their Intention, that ſuch a Regulation ſhould extend to Biſhops too; and it would be a great Irregularity, ſhould your Holineſs* (a Title then common to all Biſhops) *over-haſtily and unduly admit to your Communion Biſhops, who have been excommunicated in their own Provinces. Your Holineſs therefore muſt not receive the Presbyters, and other Clerks, who, to avoid the Puniſhment, which they deſerve, recur to you; the rather as we know of no Conſtitutions thus derogatory to the Authority of our Churches; and the Council of* Nice *has ſubjected the Biſhops themſelves to the Judgment of their Metropolitan. The Fathers of that Council have decreed, with great Wiſdom and Equity, that all Diſputes ſhould be finally determined in the Places where they began, being ſenſible, that the Grace of the Holy Spirit, neceſſary for judging rightly, would not be wanting in any Province. Eſpecially as every Man, who thinks himſelf injured, may apply for Redreſs, if he pleaſes, to the Synod of his own Province, or to a national Council. Would it not be Preſumption in any of us to ſuppoſe or imagine, that God will inſpire a particular Perſon with the Spirit of Juſtice, and refuſe it to many Biſhops aſſembled in Council? And how can a Judgment, given out of the Country, and beyond Sea, be right, where the neceſſary Witneſſes cannot be preſent, by reaſon of their Sex, of their Age, or of ſome other Impediment? As for your ſending Legates, we find no ſuch Ordinance in any Council, nor in the Writings of the Fathers. As for what you have ſent us by our Collegue* Fauſtinus, *as a Canon of the Council of* Nice, *we muſt let you know, that no ſuch Canon is to be found in the genuine and uncorrupt Copies of that Council, which have been tranſcribed and ſent us by our Fellow-Biſhop* Cyril *of* Alexandria, *and the Reverend* Atticus *of* Conſtantinople. *Thoſe Copies we ſent to* Boniface, *your Predeceſſor of worthy Memory. We therefore earneſtly beg you would ſend no more Legates, nor Eccleſiaſtics, to execute your Judgments here, leſt you ſhould ſeem to introduce worldly Pride and Arrogance* (typhum ſæculi) *into the Church of Chriſt.* They conclude with in-

Their Letter to Celeſtine.

treating him not to ſuffer *Fauſtinus* to continue any longer among them q. *Celeſtine*, finding the Spirit with which they acted, and ſenſible that it would be uſeleſs to employ Force at this Juncture, thought it adviſable to acquieſce for the preſent, and wait till a more favourable Opportunity ſhould offer for him, or his Succeſſors, to renew the Attempt (A).

Celeſtine *declares Tranſlations lawful.*

The following Year 427. *Siſinius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* being dead, the Biſhops in thoſe Parts were for appointing *Proculus* in his room. But, as *Proculus* had been ordained before, though never inſtalled Biſhop of *Cyzicus*, they were under ſome Apprehenſion, leſt his Promotion to the See of *Conſtantinople* ſhould be deemed a Breach of the *Canons*, forbidding Tranſlations. But *Cæleſtine*, whom they conſulted on this Occaſion, delivered them from that Apprehenſion, declaring, in a Letter, which he wrote at this time to *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, *John* of *Antioch*, and *Rufus* of *Theſſalonica*, that they might ſafely place on one See a Biſhop named to another, nay, and a Biſhop who actually governed another r; that is, he declared Tranſlations lawful (B).

The

q Concil. t. 2. p. 1148, 1149.

r Socr. l. 7. c. 29.

(A) *Schelſtrate* would make us believe, that *Gregory the Great* prevailed upon the *African* Biſhops to revoke the Canon forbidding the Preſbyters and inferior Clergy to appeal to *Rome* (1); and *Davidius*, That the *Africans* changed their Minds with reſpect to the Appeals of Biſhops, as ſoon as they were informed, that ſuch Appeals had been allowed, and approved of, by the Council of *Sardica* (2). But neither alledges any ſolid Reaſon, or even Conjecture, to prove Facts of ſuch Importance; nay, what *Davidius* advances is certainly falſe, ſince the Canons, forbidding all Appeals to *Rome*, made at this time, were ſtill quoted among the other Canons of the *African Collection* in 825. and confirmed by a Council held at *Carthage* that Year (3). Some pretend that *Celeſtine* ſeparated himſelf on this Occaſion from the *African* Biſhops, and that this Separation continued between their Churches, and that of *Rome*, till the Beginning of the VIIth Century, when *Eulalius* of *Carthage*, and his Collegues, deſirous of putting an End to the Schiſm, revoked all the Canons that had been made in 426. derogatory to the Rights of the *Roman* See (4). This they advance upon the Authority of a Piece commonly aſcribed to Pope *Boniface* II. But that Piece is ſo evidently ſuppoſititious, that *Baronius* himſelf is forced to give it up.

(B) Againſt Tranſlations there may be Reaſons in Policy; but there can be none in Conſcience; and none that are at all to the Purpoſe, have been alleged either by the Councils, or Fathers, though the former have exerted all their Authority to prevent them, and the latter all their Oratory to make them appear criminal. The Councils of *Arles*, of *Nice*, of *Alexandria*, of *Sardica*, of *Chalcedon*, of *Antioch*, forbid them on the ſevereſt Penalties the Church could inflict. The Council of *Sardica* by its Firſt Canon deprived ſuch Biſhops, as ſhould change their Churches, even of the Lay-Communion; and becauſe ſome pleaded, or at leaſt the Council apprehended they might plead, the Deſire and Requeſt

(1) Schel. Eccleſ. Afric. p. 50. (2) Dav. jugemens Canoniques des Eveſques, p. 663, 664. (3) Concil. t. 4. p. 1636. (4) Van Eſpen. in Can. p. 216.

of

The ſame Year *Celeſtine* wrote to *Perigenes* of *Corinth*, *Donatus* of *Nicopolis* in *Epirus*, and *Baſil* of *Lariſſa* in *Theſſaly*, all Three Metro-

His Letter to the Metropolitans of Illyricum.

of the People; to leave no room for ſuch an Excuſe, the Council by its Second Canon, deprived thoſe, who ſhould allege it, of the Lay-Communion, even at the Point of Death (1). The Council of *Alexandria*, under St. *Athanaſius*, in their Epiſtle to all the Catholic Biſhops, ſpeak thus of *Euſebius*, who had been tranſlated from *Berytus* to *Nicomedia*: Euſebius *did not reflect on the Admonition of the Apoſtle, Art thou bound to a Wife? Do not ſeek to be looſed. For if it be ſaid of a Woman, how much more of a Church? To which if one is tied, he ought not to ſeek another; that he may not be likewiſe found an Adulterer, according to the Scripture* (2). What Analogy between a Wife, and a Biſhoprick? The Biſhops of that Aſſembly were even of Opinion, that *Euſebius*, by abandoning his former Church, had annulled his Epiſcopacy. In the Synod under *Mennas* it was laid to the Charge of *Anthimus*, that being Biſhop of *Trebiſond*, he had *adulterouſly* ſeized on the See of *Conſtantinople* (3). In the ſame Strain have the Fathers declaimed againſt Tranſlations, whenever an Opportunity offered of bringing in that favourite Topic; for the Canons and Deciſions of the Councils were only the private Opinions of the major Part of the Biſhops, who compoſed them. They generally inveigh againſt that *adulterous Traffick*, as if they ſuppoſed a Biſhop to be married to the Church, which he was ordained to ſerve, or tied to it by Bonds no leſs indiſſoluble than a Huſband to his Wife: And it was upon that Suppoſition, that they charged with Adultery thoſe, who paſſed from one Church to another. But that Suppoſition none of them have been able to make good either from Scripture or Reaſon. As for the Command of the Apoſtle in his Letter to *Timothy*, *A Biſhop muſt be the Huſband of one Wife*, which ſome of them have interpreted as levelled againſt Tranſlations; the far greater Part both of the Fathers and Councils have in that Paſſage underſtood the Word *Wife*, not in a metaphorical, but a natural Senſe, and thereupon excluded from the Epiſcopal Dignity ſuch as had been twice married. But allowing St. *Paul* to have meant a *Church* by the Word *Wife*, the moſt obvious and natural Interpretation we can give to his Words, is, that he there forbids Pluralities of Biſhopricks, which were once very common in the Church of *Rome*.

But whatever Reaſons the Fathers and Councils may have alleged, or could allege, againſt Tranſlations, they have themſelves defeated them all by the contrary Practice. For ſome of the greateſt Saints, and Lights of the Church, have been either tranſlated, or approved and promoted the Tranſlations of others. The famous *Methodius*, who ſuffered under *Dioclefian* in the Year 311. or 312. paſſed from the Sea of *Olympus* in *Lycia* to that of *Tyre* (4). *Euſtathius*, who is ſuppoſed to have preſided at the Council of *Nice*, was tranſlated from *Beræa* to *Antioch*, that is, from a ſmall See to the ſecond in the Eaſt (5); nay *Sozomen* aſcribes this Tranſlation to the Council of *Nice* itſelf (6). *Syderius*, Biſhop of *Erythra* in *Libya*, was tranſlated by *Athanaſius* to *Ptolemais*, the Metropolis of the whole *Pentapolis* (7). *Euphronius* Biſhop of *Colonia*, a ſmall Town on the Borders of *Armenia*, was by a Synod, conſiſting of all the Orthodox Biſhops of that Province, tranſlated to the Metropolitan See of *Nicopolis*; that Tranſlation was highly applauded by St. *Baſil*, who thought it owing not to human Prudence, but to a particular Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt (8); the *Arians* being very powerful in that City, and no Man more fit to make head againſt them than *Euphronius*. The Inhabitants of *Colonia* were very unwilling to part with their Biſhop; and the Eccleſiaſtics there even threatened to join the *Arian* Party, if *Euphronius* was taken from them (9). But they were in the End prevailed upon by St. *Baſil* to acquieſce to the Will of God, who, ſaid he, had inſpired the Pre-

(1) Concil. t. 2. p. 628. (2) Syn. Alex. apud Athan. apol. 2. (3) Concil. ſub. Menn. p. 9. (4) Hier. vir. ill. c. 83. Socr. l. 6. c. 13. (5) Theod. l. 1. c. 6. Theoph. Eutych. & alii. (6) Soz. l. 1. c. 2. (7) Syneſ. ep. 67. (8) Baſil. ep. 292. (9) Id. ibid.

lates

Metropolitans of *Illyricum*, recommending to them an intire Submission to the See of *Rome*, and to that of *Thessalonica*; *Rufus*, who presided there, having been appointed by him to determine, in his Name, all Disputes that might arise among them. He lets them know, that, in virtue of the Submission, which they owed to the

lates with such a Resolution (10). From these (and many other Instances might be alleged) it is manifest, that the Fathers spoke like mere Declaimers, when they compared a Bishop, who left one Church, and took another, to a Husband, who abandoned his Wife, and married another Woman. But indeed they only inveighed thus, generally speaking, against Translations, when the Persons translated were of the Party, which they opposed; it was then Adultery, it was forfeiting the Episcopal Dignity, to pass from one Church to another. But when they apprehended, that such Changes could any-ways promote the Cause which they had espoused and maintained, those Changes were thereby sanctified, and owing to a particular Inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

Pope *Gelasius* II. excused Translations by the Example of St. *Peter*. *Who dares to maintain*, says he, *that St.* Peter, *the Prince of the Apostles, was to blame, for changing the See of* Antioch *for that of* Rome (11)? And who dares to maintain, that any Bishop is to blame for doing what the Prince of the Apostles had done before him? But were there no other Instances, besides that of St. *Peter*, to give a Sanction to Translations, I should readily grant them never to have been allowed in the Church. For St. *Peter* never was Bishop of *Rome*, as I have shewn already (12); and some of the Reasons, proving him never to have been Bishop of *Rome*, make equally against his pretended Episcopacy of *Antioch*. Most of the Ecclesiastical Writers indeed suppose him to have been Bishop of *Antioch*; but St. *Luke* is quite silent on that Head, though within the Compass of his History, as *Jerom* observed (13); and his Silence ought to be of more Weight, than the Authority of Writers, who lived some Ages after. *Origen*, who flourished in the Third Century, was the first who mentioned St. *Peter*'s See of *Antioch*, saying, It was held by *Ignatius* after him (14). *Origen* was copied by *Eusebius*, and *Eusebius* by those, who came after him.

On Translations a modern Writer of the Court of *Rome* reasons thus: "Translations have been severely censured by the "Fathers, and often condemned both by "the Popes and the Councils. But neither "can the Councils tie the Hands of the "Popes, nor can one Pope tie the Hands "of another. The Power of dispensing "with all canonical Impediments the Popes "hold by divine Right; which therefore "can only be restrained by divine Authority. "However, Translations ought not to be "allowed, but on most urgent Occasions; "and it is in order to prevent them, that "the Popes have adopted the wise Regula-"tions of some well-governed Republics, "where certain Goods are not prohibited, "but loaded with such Customs as are next "to a Prohibition (15)." The Canons were made for the Good of the Church, and the People; and therefore cannot be binding when they oppose either. Hence it follows, that there being in such Cases no Room left for a Dispensation, nothing ought in Justice to be exacted for it. And yet, let the Occasion be ever so urgent, a very considerable Sum must be paid into the Apostolic Chamber for the pretended Dispensation. If the Occasion is not urgent, they allow the Canons to be binding; and what can induce the Popes to dispense with them, but that, which one of them taxed those Bishops with, who seek Translations, *Avarice*, *filthy Lucre*, *and an ungodly Desire of greater Wealth* (16)? as if the Canons had been made with no other View but to give the Popes an Opportunity of filling their Coffers by granting Leave to transgress them.

(10) Id. ibid. & ep. 290. 293. (11) Gelas. II. ep. 1. (12) See above p. 5. (13) Hier. in Gal. 2. (14) Orig. in Luc. hom. 6. (15) Contius de Curia Romana. (16) Anast. ep. 2.

See

See of *Theſſalonica*, and he required of them, they were to ordain no Biſhops, aſſemble no Councils, without the Knowlege and Conſent of *Rufus*; which was reſtraining to the See of *Theſſalonica*, that is, engroſſing to himſelf (for the Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* acted only as his Vicar), the Privileges, which the Council of *Nice* had granted to all Metropolitans. It is obſervable, that in this very Letter *Cæleſtine* affects an intire Obedience to the Canons of the Church. *We ought*, ſays he, *to ſubject our Will to the Rules, and not the Rules to our Will; we ought to conform to the Canons, and ſtrictly obſerve what they preſcribe* [x]. But he did not govern himſelf by this Maxim upon other Occaſions.

He complains of ſeveral Abuſes that prevailed in ſome Churches of Gaul.

The following Year 428. he wrote a long Letter to the Biſhops of the Provinces of *Vienne* and *Narbonne*, againſt ſeveral Abuſes that prevailed in thoſe Parts. This Letter he begins quite in the Style of a modern Pope: *As I am*, ſays he, *appointed by God to watch over his Church, it is incumbent upon me every-where to root out evil Practices, and introduce good ones in their room, for my Paſtoral Vigilance is reſtrained by no Bounds, but extends to all Places, where Chriſt is known and adored.* Thus, under the Name of *Paſtoral Vigilance* he extends, at once, his Authority and Juriſdiction over all the Churches of the Chriſtian World. The firſt Abuſe he complains of was a particular Dreſs aſſumed by ſome Biſhops, wearing, in Imitation of the Monks, a Cloke and Girdle. With this Novelty *Celeſtine* finds great Fault, and exhorts the Biſhops to diſtinguiſh themſelves from the People by their Doctrine, and not by their Garments, by the Sanctity of their Manners, and not by the Mode of their Dreſs, by the internal Purity of their Souls, and not by the external Attire of their Bodies. What a large Field would the ſo many different and ridiculous Habits of the Monks and Friers, the coſtly Attire of Biſhops and Cardinals, and, above all, the gorgeous and ſtately Apparel of *Celeſtine*'s own Succeſſors, have opened for his Zeal, had he lived in our Days? He pleaſantly adds, that if they underſtood, in a literal Senſe, the Words of our Saviour, *Let your Loins be girded about* [y], they ought to interpret other Paſſages after the ſame manner, and never appear without Lamps and Staves in their Hands. And was not this condemning, at leaſt ridiculing, the Monkiſh Habits, an eſſential Part of

Biſhops not diſtinguiſhed formerly by their Dreſs from the Laity.

[x] Coll. Rom. per Holſten. p. 85—87. [y] Luke xii. 25.

which is the Girdle (A)? The other Abuſes, which *Celeſtine* wanted to have redreſſed, have nothing new in them, or that has not been mentioned before in this Hiſtory; and therefore I omit repeating them here.

The Pelagian *Doctrine prevails in* Britain.

About this time the *Pelagian* Doctrine began to prevail, almoſt univerſally, in *Britain*, being preached here either by the Natives, who had adhered to their Countryman *Pelagius* abroad, and were returned home, or by others, who, finding themſelves, in virtue of the Imperial Laws, every-where perſecuted on the Continent, had fled to this Iſland for Shelter. The leading Man of the Party here was one *Agricola*, the Son of a *Britiſh* Biſhop named *Severianus*[a]. But that *Severianus* himſelf, or any of his Collegues, countenanced their Doctrine, is not vouched by any of the Antients. *Faſtidius* indeed, a *Britiſh* Writer, who flouriſhed at this time, betrays, in his Writings, a ſtrong Bias to the *Pelagian* Tenets. But it may be juſtly queſtioned whether he was a Biſhop. For in the Treatiſe which he wrote on the Duties of a Chriſtian Life, he makes Excuſes for taking upon him to inſtruct others; which a Biſhop would hardly have done, that being his Province and Duty (B). However, if the *Britiſh* Biſhops did not countenance the *Pelagian* Doctrine, neither did they oppoſe it, at leaſt with the Vigour they might; elſe it had never made, in ſo ſhort a time, the Progreſs it did. The Catholics, having no Proſpect of Relief from their own Paſtors, had recourſe to thoſe of *Gaul*;

The Britons *recur to the*

[a] Proſp. chr.

(A) From this Paſſage it is manifeſt, that in thoſe Days the Biſhops, and other Eccleſiaſtics, were not yet diſtinguiſhed by their Dreſs from the Laity, at leaſt when they were not actually diſcharging the Functions of their Office. Whether they uſed even then any particular Dreſs or Attire, may be juſtly queſtioned. *Dionyſius Exiguus* thinks they did not (1); and F. *Sirmond* is of the ſame Opinion. For, according to *Sirmond*, the Eccleſiaſtics uſed no other Dreſs in the Church, but that which they wore daily out of the Church. However, as they reſerved the beſt Habits they had for the Sacred Functions, and uſed them on no other Occaſion, when Modes in Dreſs began to alter, the Faſhion changed before they were worn out. Thus, by degrees, the Dreſs, which they uſed in the Church, varied from their common Dreſs, as well as from that of the People; the new Habits for the Service of the Church being made after the Mode of the antient, in which they were accuſtomed to perform their Functions. *Anaſtaſius*, *Platina*, and *Baronius*, give us particular Accounts, I may ſay, the Hiſtory of every Part of the Maſs-Prieſt's Dreſs, inſtituted, according to them, and uſed long before this time.

(B) Beſides, the *Bendictines*, in their Edition of the Works of St. *Auſtin*, aſſure us, that, in a very antient Manuſcript Copy of *Gennadius*, *Faſtidius* is not ſtyled Biſhop, the Word *Biſhop* being added to the original Copy in a much freſher Hand. And yet moſt of our modern Writers not only ſuppoſe him to have been Biſhop, but Biſhop of *London* (2).

(1) Biblioth. Jur. Can. per Juſtel. t. 1. p. 210. (2) Vid. Miræum in not. ad Gennad.

who, being affected with their Complaints, immediately ſummoned a great Council, and choſe, with one Voice, St. *Germanus* Biſhop of *Auxerre*, and St. *Lupus* Biſhop of *Troyes*, to paſs over into *Britain*, and there maintain the Catholic Cauſe [b]. Thus *Conſtantius*, a Preſbyter of *Lyons*, who lived in this Century, and after him *Bede*. But *Proſper*, who flouriſhed likewiſe in this Century, writes, that the two Prelates were ſent into *Britain* by *Celeſtine* [c]. The *Gallican* Biſhops, perhaps, acquainted the Pope with the Choice they had made, and he approved it; which was enough for *Proſper*, a notorious Flatterer of the Popes, to aſcribe the Whole to *Celeſtine*. The Two Miſſionaries ſet out for *Britain* in the latter End of the Year 429. and, paſſing through *Paris*, had an Interview there with the famous St. *Genevieve*, who, at the Perſuaſion of St. *Germanus*, to whom her future Sanctity was revealed, promiſed to conſecrate her Virginity to *Jeſus Chriſt*. From *Paris* they purſued their Journey to the Sea-ſide, and embarqued; but were very near being caſt away by a Storm, before they reached the *Britiſh* Coaſt. This Storm the Author ſuppoſes to have been raiſed by the Devil; but we may more reaſonably ſuppoſe it to have been raiſed by himſelf, that he might have an Opportunity of diſplaying the Power of his Imagination in deſcribing it, and make room for the Miracle by which it was laid. For St. *Germanus*, who had ſlept the whole time, being awaked by the Mariners juſt as the Veſſel was on the point of ſinking, firſt reprimanded the Sea, as *Neptune* did of old the Winds, for attempting to defeat their pious Undertaking; and then pouring into it a few Drops of Oil, aſſwaged at once the Fury of the Waves, and miraculouſly reſtored the wiſhed-for Calm. Upon their Landing, the People flocked to them from all Parts; and, being convinced of the Truth which they preached, by the Miracles which they wrought, abjured daily by Thouſands the *Pelagian* Doctrine, which they had ſo raſhly embraced. But their Teachers and Leaders kept out of the Way: They were unwilling to enter the Liſts with Men, whom Heaven had endowed with ſuch miraculous Powers. However, as the Whole of their Cauſe was now at ſtake, they agreed, at laſt, to meet the two Prelates, and met them accordingly. But this Meeting proved fatal to the *Pelagian* Cauſe; for the *Pelagians* declining to undertake the Cure of a blind Girl that was preſented to them, St. *Germanus*, by applying to her Eyes ſome Reliques, which

Gallican Biſhops, who ſend Germanus and Lupus into Britain.

Their Journey.

Miracles wrought by them on the Sea, and after their landing.

[b] Conſtant. l. 1. c. 19. apud Surium, l. 4. [c] Proſp. chron.

The whole Island reclaimed.

he always carried about with him, cured her at once of her Blindness, and with her the whole Island [d]. But these Miracles were soon forgotten: According to the same Author, the *Pelagian* Heresy took root again, and new Miracles were wanted to check its Growth.

Germanus *returns anew, and utterly roots out the* Pelagian *Heresy.*

Germanus therefore, in the Year 447. returned to *Britain*; exerted here anew his wonder-working Power, confounded his Antagonists, and, not leaving behind him the least Shoot of so poisonous a Weed, returned in Triumph to *Gaul* [e]. In his second Jouney into *Britain* he is said to have been attended by St. *Severus*, Bishop of *Treves*.

Beginning of the Dispute between Nestorius *and St.* Cyril.

The following Year, 430. is one of the most remarkable Years in the Annals of the Church. For it was in that Year that the famous Dispute began between *Nestorius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, and St. *Cyril* Bishop of *Alexandria*, which rent the whole Church into Two opposite and irreconcileable Factions.

What occasioned this Dispute.

What gave Occasion to that Dispute was, the Title of *Mother of God*, which began at this time to be commonly given to the Virgin *Mary*. Such a Title *Nestorius* thought very improper, derogatory to the Majesty of the Eternal Creator, and only calculated to lead the Unwary into gross Mistakes concerning the Mystery of the Incarnation, and the Nature of Christ. For he argued, that it could not be said, without a kind of Blasphamy, that *God was born of a Woman*, that *God had suffered*, that *God had died*, nor, consequently, that *the Virgin* Mary *was the Mother of God. We must not imagine*, said he, *that God, or the Verb, was born of the Virgin* Mary; *but we ought to believe, that God, or the Verb, was united to him, who was born of the Virgin* Mary [f]. The Title of *Mother of Christ* was that which he thought should be given to the Virgin, as containing all that was meant by the other, without the Impropriety and Offence of the Expression, and without Danger of confounding the Divine Nature of Christ with the Human. This Doctrine was received, and maintained with great Warmth by some, both Ecclesiastics and Laymen, and with no less Warmth, opposed by others. The latter thought it was calling in question the Divinity of Christ, and degrading the Virgin *Mary*, to rob her of the glorious Title of the *Mother of God*; and her Glory was now become one of their highest Concerns.

The Characters of Cyril *and* Nestorius.

At the Head of these was St. *Cyril*, a Man of a most haughty and imperious Temper, impatient of Contradiction, obstinately wedded to his own Opinion, passionate, revengeful, and more eagerly bent,

[d] Constant. ubi supra. [e] Constant. vit. S. Ger. l. 2. c. 1. apud Sur. t. 3. 30. Julii.
[f] Concil. t. 3. p. 1124. Cyr. ep. 38. Petav. dog. theolog. t. 4. l. 1. c. 7.

at leaſt in the preſent Diſpute, upon conquering his Adverſary, than diſcovering the Truth. In ſome of theſe Qualities he was well matched by *Neſtorius*; but the latter was not ſo eager for Victory, ſo tenacious of his own Opinion, or rather of his own Terms (for the whole Diſpute was about Terms), as not to be ready to explain them; which had he been allowed to do, an End had been put at once to the Quarrel. But *Cyril* would hearken to no Explanations. He peremptorily required *Neſtorius* to acknowlege and confeſs the Virgin *Mary* to be the *Mother of God*, without any Diſtinction or Explanation; and becauſe he would not comply, he defamed him all over the Eaſt, as a Reviver of the Hereſy of *Paul* of *Samoſata*, denying the real Union between the Human and the Divine Nature in the Perſon of Chriſt; ſtirred up the People of *Conſtantinople*, his own Flock, againſt him, and ſpared no Pains to diſcredit him with the Emperor, and other great Perſons at Court. For he wrote Three Letters to Court; one to the Emperor *Theodoſius*, to his Wife *Eudoxia*, and to his Siſter *Pulcheria*; another *to the Queen's Virgins, and Brides of Chriſt*, that is, to *Pulcheria* and her Siſters; and a third *to the Empreſſes*, that is, to *Eudoxia* and *Pulcheria*. The Purport of theſe Letters was to prove, that the Virgin *Mary* was, and ought to be ſtyled, the *Mother of God*; that to diſpute ſuch a Title was rank Hereſy; and that whoever diſputed it was unworthy of the Protection of the Imperial Family.

Cyril *will not allow* Neſtorius *to explain his Meaning.* *He defames him, and writes againſt him to the Emperor.*

Neſtorius, being now ſenſible, that *Cyril* was determined to keep no Meaſures with him, reſolved, in his Turn, to keep none with one, who had given him ſo great Provocation. He therefore aſſembled a Council at *Conſtantinople*, and there, with the unanimous Conſent of the Biſhops who compoſed it, he ſolemnly excommunicated the Laymen, and depoſed the Eccleſiaſtics, who rejected his Doctrine g. He did not ſtop here; but cauſed ſeveral Eccleſiaſtics, Monks, and Laymen, the Friends of *Cyril*, to be apprehended, to be dragged to the public Priſon, and to be there whipt very ſeverely, as Diſturbers of the public Peace, and Sowers of Hereſy and Sedition. What chiefly provoked him, was a Paper poſted up in a public Place of the City, declaring him a Heretic, and guilty of the Hereſy formerly held by *Paul* of *Samoſata*, denying a true Union between the Verb and the Humanity in the Perſon of Chriſt; which was one of the many Calumnies broached againſt him by *Cyril* to blacken his Reputation.

Neſtorius *excommunicates and depoſes thoſe who ſide with* Cyril. *Cauſes ſome of them to be impriſoned and whipt.*

g Concil. t. 3. p. 327.

Nestorius *strives to gain* Celestine *and the Western Bishops.*

Thus were the Christians in the East divided into two opposite Parties, irreconcileably incensed against each other, and reviling each other with all the opprobrious Names Malice and Rage could suggest. But *Cyril*'s Party was by far the most numerous and powerful. *Nestorius* therefore, having strove in vain to strengthen his Party in the East, resolved in the End to try the West, being well apprised, that the Authority of the Bishop of *Rome*, and the other Western Bishops, would be abundantly sufficient to turn the Scale. He therefore wrote a long Letter to *Celestine*, acquainting him with what had passed in the East, and explaining, without the least Disguise or Equivocation, the Doctrine he held; nay, he sent him all the Homilies, which he had preached on that Subject. In this Letter he owns his irreconcileable Aversion to the Words *Mother of God*, as raising Ideas, especially in the Minds of the Vulgar, inconsistent with the Majesty of the Supreme Being. He adds, that by disputing the Title *Mother of God*, he only meant, that the Verb was not born of the Virgin *Mary* [1].

Cyril *writes to* Celestine, *and sends him the Homilies of* Nestorius, *with his own Comments upon them.*

St. *Cyril*, being informed, that *Nestorius* had wrote to *Celestine*, summoned a Council at *Alexandria*; and, by their Advice, wrote the famous Letter to *Celestine*, which has reached our Times. In that Letter he acquaints him with the State of Affairs in the East, and the Disturbances raised there by *Nestorius*, as if himself had been no-ways concerned in them; tells him that it is absolutely necessary that all the Bishops of the Church should unite as one Man against that Prelate; that the Bishops in the East are well disposed to join in the common Cause; and that they only waited to know from him, whether they were to communicate with *Nestorius*, or openly renounce his Communion. At the same time *Cyril* sent to *Rome* the Homilies of *Nestorius*, the Letters which he had wrote to him, his Answers, and with them a Writing containing the Sentiments of the Fathers concerning the Mystery of the Incarnation. For the Gospel, the *Testimony of Christ*, was already laid aside, and the Testimony of Men taken, in most Disputes, for the Rule and Standard of the Christian Belief. The *Roman Catholics* have no Reason to brag, as they do, of the Recourse had by St. *Cyril* on this Occasion to the Pope. For *Posidonius*, one of *Cyril*'s Deacons, who was dispatched with the above-mentioned Papers to *Rome*, was directed, in his private Instructions, not to deliver them, but to bring them back to *Alexandria*, if

The Popish Writers have no Occasion to brag of the Recourse had by Cyril *to* Celestine.

[1] Conc. t. 3. p. 349—356.

he

he found that *Neſtorius* had not applied to *Celeſtine* [m]; ſo that if *Neſtorius* had not recurred to the Pope, *Cyril* never would. *Poſidonius* found, upon Inquiry, that *Neſtorius* had wrote to *Celeſtine*; and therefore delivered to him, purſuant to his Inſtructions, all the Papers with which he was charged. *Cyril* wrote in *Latin*, and even cauſed the Homilies of *Neſtorius* to be tranſlated into that Language, with his his own Comments upon them; whereas *Neſtorius* had ſent them in the original *Greek*, and writ his Letters in the ſame Tongue; which had obliged *Celeſtine* to ſend them into *Gaul*, to be tranſlated there by the famous *Caſſian*, who was a Native of *Thrace*, and lived then at *Marſeilles*, there being none, it ſeems, in *Rome* or *Italy*, ſufficiently qualified for that Task. *Cyril* having thus got the Start of his Antagoniſt, though he wrote the laſt, *Celeſtine* was, by his Writings, prejudiced to ſuch a Degree againſt *Neſtorius*, before he had heard what he he had to offer in his Defence, that all he did or could offer afterwards availed him nothing. *Celeſtine* indeed peruſed all his Papers as ſoon as they were tranſlated and ſent back from *Gaul*, but peruſed them with the ſtrong Prejudices which he had imbibed from the Writings of *Cyril*; ſo that he diſcovered in each Homily, nay, in every Line, *Hereſies*, *Impieties*, and *Blaſphemies*, not to be uttered or heard.

A Council was therefore aſſembled at *Rome*, to condemn, rather than to examine, the *new Doctrine*. At this Council aſſiſted moſt of the Weſtern Biſhops [n]; *Celeſtine* preſided, the Homilies were read, and with them the Letters both of *Cyril* and *Neſtorius*. *Celeſtine* made a long Speech, to prove not only by the Paſſages which *Cyril* had ſuggeſted to him out of the Fathers, but by others from St. *Hilarius*, from Pope *Damaſus*, and from a Hymn which St. *Ambroſe* had cauſed to be yearly ſung by his People on *Chriſtmas day*, that *the Virgin* Mary *was truly the Mother of God* [o]. When he had done, *Neſtorius* was declared the Author of a *new and very dangerous Hereſy*, *Cyril* was highly extolled for oppoſing it, his Doctrine was applauded by all as ſtrictly orthodox, and Sentence of Depoſition pronounced againſt ſuch Eccleſiaſtics as ſhould refuſe to ſign it.

Neſtorius condemned by a Council held at Rome.

Before the Council broke up *Celeſtine* wrote to *Neſtorius*, acquainting him with the Judgment of the Weſtern Biſhops upon this Diſpute; and at the ſame time warning him, that if, in the Term of Ten Days

Celeſtine acquaints Neſtorius *with the Judgment of the Weſtern Biſhops.*

[m] Concil. t. 3. p. 346. & concil. app. per Baluſ. p. 45. [n] Mercat. t. 1. p. 71.
[o] Concil. t. 3. p. 379. Arnobii Junioris cum Serap. conflict. p. 548.

after

after the Receipt of that Letter, he did not publicly condemn the Doctrine which he had hitherto taught, and teach the Doctrine which he had hitherto condemned, he ſhould be depoſed without any further Delay, and cut off from the Communion of the Church [p]. This Letter is dated the 11th of *Auguſt* of this Year 430. He wrote ſeveral other Letters, all bearing the ſame Date, *viz.* one to *Cyril*, one to the Clergy, Monks, and People of *Conſtantinople*; one to each of the Biſhops of the chief Sees, and one to the Church of *Antioch*. All theſe Letters were to the ſame Effect, *viz.* to acquaint thoſe, to whom they were addreſſed, with the Sentence pronounced by the Council of *Rome* againſt *Neſtorius*, and encourage them to be aſſiſting in the Execution of it. His Letter to *Cyril* deſerves particular Notice: for he there appoints him to act in the preſent Affair, that is, in excommunicating and depoſing *Neſtorius*, as *his Vicegerent, in the Name, and with the Authority, of his See* [q]. It muſt be obſerved here, that the Biſhops of *Rome*, neither alone, nor jointly with the whole Body of the Weſtern Biſhops, had, or even claimed at this time, the Power of depoſing the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, or indeed any other Biſhop in the Eaſt, without the Conſent and Concurrence of the Eaſtern Biſhops. This *Cyril* well knew; and therefore, leſt *Celeſtine* ſhould, on that Conſideration, decline giving Judgment againſt *Neſtorius*, he made him believe that the Eaſtern Biſhops were all diſpoſed to join againſt the pretended Hereſiarch; that they waited only his Determination, and were ready to concur, to a Man, in executing the Judgment which he ſhould give. This was making *Celeſtine* believe, that the Eaſtern Biſhops had choſen him for their Judge in the preſent Diſpute, and agreed to acquieſce to his Deciſion. It was upon this Preſumption that *Celeſtine* pronounced the abovementioned Sentence againſt *Neſtorius*, and appointed *Cyril* to act in his room, with the Authority which he falſely ſuppoſed to have been granted him on this Occaſion. I ſay, *falſely*; for what *Cyril* wrote to him was abſolutely falſe, *viz.* that all the Biſhops in the Eaſt were ready to join him againſt *Neſtoeius*, and concur in executing the Sentence which he ſhould pronounce. Several Biſhops had declared for *Neſtorius*, and not one, that we know of, againſt him, at the time *Cyril* wrote, beſides *Cyril* himſelf, and the other *Egyptian* Biſhops, who were intirely governed by him; nay, the Sentence pronounced at *Rome* was Matter

Celeſtine appoints Cyril his Vicegerent.

He is impoſed upon by Cyril.

[p] Concil. t. 3. p. 374—376. [q] Ibid. p. 349.

of

of great Surprize to all, but more eſpecially to *John* of *Antioch*, and *Juvenal* of *Jeruſalem*, who could not help cenſuring, with ſome Sharpneſs, the Weſtern Biſhops, as acting raſhly in an Affair that required the moſt mature Deliberation. But *Cyril* was chiefly to blame, who, to engage the Weſtern Biſhops on his Side, and by their means compaſs the Ruin of his Antagoniſt, had repreſented the State of Affairs very differently from what it really was.

It was doubtleſs a very extraordinary Thing for a Biſhop of *Alexandria* to accept the Commiſſion of Vicegerent or Deputy to the Biſhop of *Rome*; and *Celeſtine* would hardly have thought of offering him ſuch a Commiſſion, if he had not been ſenſible that, from the Heat of his Paſſion upon this Occaſion, he would be willing to act in any Capacity, that would impower him to hurt his Antagoniſt. So ably did the Popes, from the earlieſt times, avail themſelves of every Circumſtance that could give them the Means to promote and extend their Juriſdiction?

Cyril *ſends* Celeſtine's *Letter to* Neſtorius;

The abovementioned Letters from *Celeſtine* were all ſent to *Cyril*, who was to convey them to thoſe they were addreſſed to; which he did accordingly, accompanying them with Letters of his own, all calculated to inſtame his Collegues and the reſt of the Clergy, as well as the Laity, againſt *Neſtorius*, as an Enemy to *the Mother of God* and the Catholic Church. As for the Letter to *Neſtorius* himſelf, he diſpatched Four Biſhops with it to *Conſtantinople*, who choſe to deliver it to him while he was aſſiſting at Divine Service, in the great Church, with his Clergy, and many Perſons of Diſtinction belonging to the Court. His View in this was to render their Legation the more ſolemn, and thereby alarm the Populace, who hitherto had taken no part in the Quarrel. With *Celeſtine*'s Letter they delivered to him one from *Cyril*, peremptorily requiring him to retract his Errors, to confirm his Retractation with a ſolemn Oath, and publicly to anathematize Twelve Propoſitions contained in the Letter, and extracted out of his Works. *Cyril* let him know, that if he did not comply with his Demand, before the time prefixed by *Celeſtine* was expired, he would take care to have the Sentence of the Weſtern Biſhops executed with the utmoſt Rigour and Severity. *Neſtorius* received the Letters, and deſired the Legates to meet him the next Day at his own Houſe; but when they came, he did not admit them; nor did he return any Anſwer either to *Celeſtine* or *Cyril*. However, in a Sermon which he preached Six Days after, that is on *Saturday* the 13th of *December*, he declared,

and requires him to retract his pretended Errors on pain of being depoſed.

declared, that, to maintain the Peace and Tranquillity of the Church, to put an End to the present Dispute, which might be attended with greater Evils than his Enemies seemed to be aware of, he was ready to grant the Title of *Mother of God* to the Virgin *Mary*, *provided nothing else was thereby meant*; but that *the Man born of her was united to the Divinity* [r]. This Sermon, and another which he preached the next Day, the 14th of *December*, on the same Subject, he sent to *John* Bishop of *Antioch*, one of the most eminent Prelates both for Piety and Learning at that time in the Church. *John* perused them with great Attention, and finding nothing in them that was not, in his Opinion, intirely agreeable to the Catholic Doctrine, he concluded the present Dispute to be happily ended. But *Cyril* was not yet satisfied; he peremptorily required *Nestorius* to anathematize the Twelve Propositions which I have mentioned above; and to anathematize them was, in the Opinion of the Bishop of *Antioch*, and of almost all the Bishops of his Patriarchate, anathematizing the Doctrine of the Church, and approving that of the *Apollinarists*, which had been condemned by the Church. For *Cyril*, in combating the Distinction maintained by *Nestorius* between the Two Natures in Christ, seemed to have run headlong into the opposite Doctrine confounding the Two Natures; insomuch that *John* of *Antioch* thought himself not only obliged to warn his Collegues in the East, by a circular Letter, against such *impious Doctrines*, but to cause them to be confuted in Writing, by Two of the most learned Prelates of his Patriarchate [s]. They were answered by *Cyril*, incapable of yielding, or ever giving up a Cause, which he had once undertaken to defend. Thus a new Quarrel broke out between *Cyril* and the Bishops of the Patriarchate of *Antioch*, of which it is foreign to my Purpose to give here an Account.

Nestorius inclined to yield for the sake of Peace.

The Doctrine of Cyril *judged impious by the Orientals.*

Nestorius, foreseeing the Storm that the Dispute between him and *Cyril* was likely to raise in the Church, had, in order to prevent it, applied to the Emperor *Theodosius* for the assembling an Oecumenical Council, even before he received the Letters of *Celestine* and *Cyril*, which I have mentioned above; and, upon his Application, the Emperor had summoned a Council to meet at *Ephesus* by *Whitsuntide* of the following Year 431. The Letter, which *Theodosius* wrote on that Occasion, was dated the 19th of *November* 430. and addressed to all

An Oecumenical Council summoned by the Emperor to meet at Ephesus.

[r] Concil. t. 3. p. 395—410. Socr. l. 7. c. 34.

[s] Concil. t. 3. p. 1150. Liberat. c. 4.

the Metropolitans, who were thereby injoined to attend at the Place and Time appointed, and bring with them ſuch of their Suffragans as might be well ſpared from the Service of the Churches in their reſpective Provinces. Beſides the circular Letter to all Metropolitans in common, *Theodoſius* wrote to *Cyril* in particular, to let him know that he looked upon him as the ſole Author of the preſent Diſturbances, and therefore expected that he would not fail to attend the Council at the time appointed; that from him he would admit of no Excuſe; that his punctual Compliance with the preſent Order was the only means of regaining his Favour, and inclining him to think that it was not any private Pique, or Animoſity, but a Perſuaſion that he was defending the Truth, which had prompted him to act, as he had hitherto done, ſo contrary to all the Rules of Modeſty and Diſcretion. In the ſame Letter he reproaches *Cyril*, and in the ſharpeſt Terms, with Pride, Arrogance, and Preſumption; and even charges him with having attempted to ſow Diviſions in the Imperial Family. But this Charge was groundleſs, having no other Foundation, but *Cyril*'s having wrote apart to *Pulcheria* and her Siſters, which the Emperor ſuppoſed to have been done with a Deſign to raiſe a Miſunderſtanding between him and them [t].

His Letter to Cyril.

The Council met at the Time and Place appointed, purſuant to the Emperor's Orders. But every thing was tranſacted in that Aſſembly ſo contrary to all the Rules of Juſtice, and even of Decency, with ſo much Prejudice and Animoſity, that they ſeemed to be all actuated by the Spirit of *Cyril*, and to have met with no other View than to gratify his private Paſſion and Revenge. *Cyril* preſided, who was the Party concerned, and the avowed Enemy of *Neſtorius*. They began their Seſſions before the Arrival of *John* of *Antioch*, and the Biſhops of that Patriarchate, who were ſuppoſed to favour *Neſtorius*, though they had certain Intelligence of their being within a few Days Journey of *Epheſus*; nay, they would not even wait for the Pope's Legates, and a good number of Biſhops who were coming from *Italy*, and the Iſland of *Sicily*. *Neſtorius*, and Count *Candidianus*, whom the Emperor had ſent to aſſiſt at the Council in his Name, earneſtly begged them to put off the Seſſions only for Four Days longer, aſſuring them that *John* and his Suffragans would reach *Epheſus* within that Time. But all in vain: they were determined to condemn *Neſtorius*, right or wrong; and therefore could by no means be prevailed upon

Irregular Proceedings of the Council.

[t] Liberat. c. 4. Concil. t. 3. p. 434.

to wait the Arrival of those who, they apprehended, would oppose, and perhaps might intirely defeat the End for which alone they seemed to believe they had been assembled. *Nestorius* was summoned to appear the very next Day, and clear himself before the Council of the impious Doctrine with which he was charged. He refused to comply till the Orientals, that is, those of the Patriarchate of *Antioch*, were arrived; and, upon that Refusal, the Council met very early next Morning, read all his Letters and Homilies, condemned the Doctrine they contained, approved the Doctrine of *Cyril*, whose Letters were likewise read; and closed this very remarkable Session with pronouncing Sentence of Deposition and Excommunication against *Nestorius* in the following Terms; *Our Lord Jesus Christ, against whom the most wicked* Nestorius *has leveled his Blasphemies, declares him, by the Mouth of this Council, deprived of the Episcopal Dignity, and cut off from the Communion of the Episcopal Order* [u]. This Sentence was signed by all the Bishops who were present, pasted up in the most public Places of *Ephesus*, and notified to all the Inhabitants by the Criers of the City. It was no sooner known than the whole City resounded with loud Shouts of Joy, the Streets were illuminated, and the People, crouding to the Church where the Council was held, attended the Bishops, with lighted Torches in their Hands, and great Acclamations, to their respective Habitations, the Women walking before them, and burning Perfumes [w]. It had been as dangerous for *Nestorius* to shew himself in *Ephesus*, at this Juncture, as it was formerly for St. *Paul*, the *Ephesians* being no less devoted now to the Virgin *Mary* than they were in the Apostle's Time to their great *Diana*, and their Superstition no less mischievous, though the Object was changed. The Virgin *Mary* was the Patroness of *Ephesus*, the *Ephesians* believing then that they possessed her Body. But it is now believed by the Church of *Rome* that she was taken up in Soul and Body into Heaven, and the Festival of her *Assumption* is kept with great Solemnity on the 15th of *August*, being preceeded by a Vigil or Fast.

The Sentence they pronounced against Nestorius.

In what terms they acquainted Nestorius *with the Sentence pronounced against him.*

The Council took care to acquaint *Nestorius* with the Sentence which they had pronounced against him; and the Note, which they wrote to him on that Occasion, shews but too plainly that they were swayed in all they did by Passion alone. For the Note was thus directed; *To* Nestorius *a second* Judas [x].

[u] Concil. ibid. p. 534. [w] Concil. ibid. p. 534—547. [x] Concil. t. 1. p. 560.

Such

Such is the Account which the Antients give us of the Firſt Oecumenical Council of *Epheſus*, one of the Four, which *Gregory the Great* received with as much Veneration as the Four Goſpels [y]. But notwithſtanding his Authority, we may, perhaps, with more Truth, apply to this Council than to any other what *Nazianzen* wrote of the Councils of his Time, *viz.* that *he had never ſeen an Aſſembly of Biſhops that ended well*; that, *by aſſembling, they had always heightened rather than cured the Evil*; that *in ſuch Aſſemblies, Paſſion, Jealouſy, Prejudice, Envy, the Deſire of Victory generally prevailed*; and that *thoſe who took upon them to judge others, were, generally ſpeaking, ſwayed by ſome private Grudge, their Zeal being owing more to the Ill-will which they bore to the Criminals; than the Averſion which they had to their Crimes* [z]. As to the preſent Aſſembly, it may be juſtly queſtioned whether it deſerves the Name of a Council, or ought not rather to be ſtyled a ſeditious and tumultuary Conventicle of Men, aſſembled with no other View but to revenge the private Quarrel of their Head and Leader. For they met againſt the Will of the Imperial Commiſſioner Count *Candidianus*, who repreſented the Perſon of the Emperor; nay, upon his acquainting them, that it was the Will of the Emperor they ſhould wait the Arrival of the Oriental and Weſtern Biſhops, they drove him by Force out of the Aſſembly. *Candidianus*, ſeeing the Emperor's Orders thus trampled under foot by the riotous Biſhops, entered a Proteſt againſt their Proceedings, and declared them null. This Proteſt was addreſſed, *To* Cyril, *and the Biſhops aſſembled with him* [a]. *Neſtorius* likewiſe, Seven Biſhops who were aſſembled with him, and Sixty-eight more, all proteſted againſt the Meeting of the Council till the Arrival of the Orientals: ſo that Seventy-ſix Biſhops, who were then actually in *Epheſus*, proteſted againſt, and abſented themſelves from the Gouncil. As therefore neither the Orientals, nor the Weſtern Biſhops, were yet come, the Aſſembly was compoſed only of *Egyptians* and *Aſiatics*, who were intirely devoted to *Cyril*. But how irregular ſoever their Meeting was, their Method of acting, after they met, was no leſs irregular. *Cyril*, who was the Party concerned, and the avowed Enemy of *Neſtorius*, received the Depoſitions againſt him, examined the Witneſſes, gave what Explication he pleaſed to his Words, and delivered his Opinion the firſt; which was acting in open Con-

The Council of Epheſus *unworthy of that Name.*

Is proteſted againſt by the Imperial Commiſſioner and Seventy-ſix Biſhops.

They act contrary to all Rules of Juſtice and Religion.

[y] Greg. l. 1. ep. 24. [z] Naz. ep. 55. [a] Concil. ibid. p. 702.

tradiction to the known Laws of Justice and Religion. In the first Session, several Things were transacted, that might have given full Employment for several Sessions. How could they examine, in so short a time, the Twelve Propositions which *Cyril* required *Nestorius* to anathematize, Propositions that were capable of so many different Interpretations, that were afterwards so differently interpreted, and occasioned endless Quarrels and Disputes, some admitting them as Catholic, and rejecting the opposite Propositions as heretical; others admitting the opposite Propositions as Catholic, and rejecting them as heretical, without being able to agree in any thing else but in anathematizing and cursing each other? How could they compare the many Passages out of the Homilies of *Nestorius*, with the different Contexts, in order to find out his true Meaning? To examine so many different Propositions, all relating to a Subject above our Comprehension, and in Terms hardly intelligible to the most speculative Understanding; to declare which were Heterodox, and which Orthodox, which were agreeable, and which disagreeable, to the Doctrine of the Fathers (for the Scripture was out of the Question), and all this in a few Hours, was, it must be owned, a most wondrous Performance. But the Orientals were at hand: *John* of *Antioch* was a Man of great Credit; it was apprehended, that the many Bishops, who were then in *Ephesus*, and had absented themselves from the Council, might join him, and he *Nestorius*. Dispatch was therefore to be used, and the Business of many Sessions transacted in one, that *Cyril* might have his full Revenge before their Arrival.

The Conduct of Cyril *sharply censured by his greatest Friends.*

It was in this Light that the Conduct of *Cyril* and the other Bishops appeared to St. *Isidore* of *Pelusium*, a Prelate of great Learning and Sagacity, and one who professed a particular Friendship for *Cyril*. For, being informed of what had passed at *Ephesus*, he was so shocked at the Conduct of his Friend, that he could not help censuring it with great Severity. *Your Conduct*, said he, in a private Letter to him, *and the Tragedy which you have lately acted at* Ephesus, *are Matter of great Surprize to some, and Diversion to others. It is publicly said, that you sought only to be revenged on your Enemies, and that you have therein imitated your Uncle* Theophylus; *and, indeed, though the Persons accused may be different, the Conduct of the Accusers is the same. You had better have continued quiet, than revenged your private Injuries at the Expence of the public Peace, and Tranquillity of the Church, by sowing Dissensions among her Members,*

bers, under the Colour of Piety and Religion [a], *Theophylus*, whom *Iſidore* mentions in his Letter, was Biſhop of *Alexandria*, Uncle to *Cyril*, and at the Head of the Faction that depoſed *Chryſoſtom* [b].

Five Days after the Depoſition of *Neſtorius*, *John* of *Antioch* and the Orientals arrived; and great was their Surprize, when they were informed by Count *Candidianus*, who came to wait on them, of what had paſſed. *John* had always adviſed *Neſtorius* to allow the Title of *Mother of God* to the Virgin *Mary*, for the ſake of Peace; but could not think him an Heretic for diſputing it. But, as to the Doctrine of *Cyril*, he looked upon it as rank *Apollinariſm*; and, as ſuch, had cauſed it to be confuted. No wonder, therefore, if, upon hearing that the Doctrine of *Cyril* had been declared Catholic, that the Doctrine of *Neſtorius* had been condemned as Heretical, and he excommunicated and depoſed for holding it, He inſiſted, as he did, upon their agreeing to have thoſe Points examined anew, and more maturely, before he would aſſiſt at the Council. This Demand he thought the more reaſonable, as *Cyril* had aſſured him, by a Letter dated but Two Days before the Meeting of the Council, that they ſhould not meet till his Arrival. But *Cyril*, as we may well imagine, would by no means conſent to it; which ſo provoked *John*, that, after ſeveral Expoſtulatory Letters between him and *Cyril*, he aſſembled, at laſt, his Orientals apart, and, with them, ſuch as adhered to him, about Fifty in all. In this new Council, the Proceedings of the other were examined; and, being found repugnant to the Canons, and owing merely to Rancour and Paſſion, they were, by the whole Aſſembly, with one Voice, declared null. The Orientals did not ſtop here; but, after a ſtrict Examination of the Doctrine of *Cyril*, they declared it Heretical; and, in virtue of that Declaration, pronounced Sentence of Excommunication and Depoſition againſt him, againſt *Memnon* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, a zealous Stickler for his Doctrine, and againſt all the Biſhops who ſhould communicate with either, till they had publicly retracted their Errors. The Blow was ſoon returned by *Cyril*, and thoſe who ſided with him; the Orientals were all declared *Neſtorians*, and, with *Neſtorius*, depoſed, excommunicated, anathematized. War being thus declared between the Two Councils, Expreſſes were immediately diſpatched, by both, to the Emperor, and their Friends at Court; for they were both ſenſible, that the Doctrine of thoſe, who had moſt Friends there, would, in the End, prove the moſt Orthodox. The Emperor read,

The Orientals arrive.

They inſiſt upon the Points that had been ſo haſtily decided, to be examined anew.

Which being refuſed by Cyril, *they aſſemble apart.*

The Two Councils anathematize and excommunicate one another.

Both recur to the Emperor.

[a] Iſid. Pel. l. 2. ep. 110. [b] See above, p. 294.

with

with great Attention, the Accounts transmitted to him by both Parties, and would have approved and confirmed the Proceedings of the Orientals, had he not been diverted from it, first by his Physician named *John*, and afterwards by *Acacius* Bishop of *Berœa*, who happened to be then at Court. For the present *Theodosius* contented himself with approving the Deposition of *Nestorius*, of *Cyril*, and of *Memnon*, who, he said, well deserved such a Punishment, as being the chief Authors of the present Disturbances; *for, as to their Faith*, he added, *I believe they are all Three alike Orthodox.* Which was true; and more than both Councils had been able to find out.

He approves the Deposition of Nestorius, Cyril, *and* Memnon.

The Emperor, having taken this Resolution, dispatched Count *John* to *Ephesus*, with Orders to drive the Three Incendiaries, *Nestorius*, *Cyril*, and *Memnon*, out of the City, and persuade the Bishops to assemble in One Council. Count *John*, soon after his Arrival, caused the Three Bishops to be arrested, and confined; but could by no Means bring about an Accommodation between the Two Parties; the Orientals obstinately refusing to communicate with the Friends of *Cyril*, till they had anathematized his Doctrine; and his Friends no less obstinately requiring the Orientals to anathematize the Doctrine of *Nestorius*, before they would communicate with them: so that *John* was obliged, in the End, notwithstanding all the Pains he took, to acquaint the Emperor, that he had found the Minds of the Bishops so soured and exasperatd against one another, that it was impossible ever to reconcile them. The Emperor, upon the Receipt of his Letter, dispatched an Order to both Councils, injoining them to send a certain Number of Deputies, both the same Number, to *Constantinople*, where he proposed to have the Points in Dispute impartially examined. In Compliance with this Order, the Two Councils sent each Eight Deputies, who immediately set out, with proper Instructions, for *Constantinople*; but, arriving at *Chalcedon*, on the opposite Side of the *Bosphorus*, they were stopped there, by an Order from the Emperor, it not being thought safe for the Orientals to enter *Constantinople*, the Monks, who were very numerous in that City, having prejudiced the Populace against them. They arrived at *Chalcedon* in the latter End of *August*; and, on the 4th of *September*, the Emperor came to the Palace of *Ruffinus*, in that Neighbourhood, and there heard both Parties, with great Patience. He was, at first, so favourable to the Orientals, that they thought themselves sure of Victory; and even wrote to their Friends at *Ephesus*, desiring them to thank him for the Kindness he had shewn them. But, to their

All Three arrested by the Emperor's Order, who endeavours, in vain, to reconcile the Bishops.

He orders both Councils to send a certain Number of Deputies to Constantinople.

He hears them at Chalcedon.

Is, at first, favourable to the Orientals and Nestorius; *but afterwards declares against them.*

great Surprize, the Face of Affairs changed at once. They had been already admitted Four times to the Emperor's Preſence, and heard by him with much Kindneſs: but, in the Fifth Audience, which they thought would complete their Triumph, the Emperor, after receiving them with great Coolneſs, told them, abruptly, that they had better admit both *Memnon* and *Cyril* to their Communion, and abandon the Defence of *Neſtorius*. They were thunderſtruck with ſuch a Propoſal, and ſtrongly remonſtrated againſt it. But *Theodoſius*, deaf to their Remonſtrances, returned the next Day to *Conſtantinople*, carrying with him the Deputies of the adverſe Party, in order to have a new Biſhop ordained by them, in the room of *Neſtorius*. Soon after his Return, he iſſued an Edict, declaring *Neſtorius* juſtly depoſed, reinſtating *Cyril* and *Memnon* in their Sees, and giving all the other Biſhops Leave to return to their reſpective Churches, they being all alike Orthodox [d]. This was declaring the Council diſſolved; and it was diſſolved accordingly; but the Diſturbances which it occaſioned, were not compoſed till many Years after.

To what this Change was owing.

The ſudden Change in the Emperor, with reſpect to the Orientals, is aſcribed by *Acacius* Biſhop of *Beræa*, to the Gold that *Cyril* cauſed to be prodigally diſtributed, on this Occaſion, among the Courtiers. For *Acacius* writes, that one of the Eunuchs of the Court, by Name *Scholaſticus*, dying poſſeſſed of great Wealth, the Emperor found a Note among his Papers, acknowleging the Receipt of large Sums remitted to him by *Paul*, *Cyril*'s Nephew, in *Cyril*'s Name [e]. It is true, we are not bound to give Credit to *Acacius*. as *Du Pin* obſerves. But in what other Manner can we account for ſo ſudden a Change, for ſuch an inconſiſtent Method of acting? The Emperor thinks both Parties equally Orthodox, and yet declares *Neſtorius* juſtly depoſed, and reſtores *Cyril* and *Memnon* to their Sees; and that ſoon after he had appeared more favourable to the Friends of *Neſtorius* than to thoſe of *Cyril*. To what elſe could this be owing, if it was not the Effect of Bribery?

The Pope's Legates, *viz.* *Arcadius*, *Projectus*, and *Philippus*, the two former Biſhops, and the latter a Presbyter, did not arrive at *Epheſus* till ſome time after the Condemnation of *Neſtorius*; but they ſigned the Judgment that had been given againſt him, being directed by *Celeſtine* to *agree in all things with* Cyril. *Cyril* preſided

[d] Concil. t. 3. p. 727—730. Cotel. Monum. Eccl. Græc. p. 41. [e] Lup. diverſ. ep. c. 41.

as

Cyril *did not preside as the Pope's Legate.*

as Bishop of *Alexandria*, the first See after that of *Rome*. While he was absent, *Juvenal* Bishop of *Jerusalem* supplied his room; a plain Proof, that he did not preside as the Pope's Legate; for if he had, his room would not have been supplied by the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, but by Them. Besides, if *Cyril* had been vested with the Character of the Pope's Legate, what Occasion had there been to send Three more? *Bellarmine* and *Baronius* both allow this Council to have been assembled by the Emperor; but with the previous Approbation, say they, and by the Advice of *Celestine*. That the Council was convened by the Emperor, is past all doubt, it being said, and repeated above twenty times in the Acts, that *they were assembled by the Will of the most religious Emperors*. But of *Celestine* not the least mention is ever made by any of the Fathers, not even by *Cyril*. The above-mentioned Writers found their Assertion on a Letter of St. *Austin*, and on the Acts of St. *Petronius*. But both these Pieces are now universally rejected as supposititious.

The Council assembled without the Approbation of the Pope.

The whole Dispute about Words.

As to the Dispute, which occasioned the assembling of this Council, the contending Parties seem to have agreed in the Substance, and to have only quarreled about Words: at least the Emperor thought so, as I have observed above; and, what is more, *Nestorius* himself. For in the Letter, which he wrote to *Celestine*, acquainting him with the Resolution *Theodosius* had taken of assembling a Council, he only told him, that it was for some important Affairs of the Church; adding, that as to the Dispute between him and the Bishop of *Alexandria*, it was not a Matter of such mighty Moment, as to require the Decision of an Oecumenical Council. And truly both *Nestorius* and *Cyril*, so far as we can judge from their own Words, acknowleged One Person in Christ, and Two Natures, the Natures distinct, but inseparably united; which was the Catholic Belief. Now the Subject of the Dispute was, whether, in virtue of that Union between the Human and Divine Nature, the Properties of the former might, or might not, be ascribed to God, and those of the latter to Man. The Negative was maintained by *Nestorius*, and the Affirmative by *Cyril*; the one rejecting as blasphemous, and the other admitting as orthodox, the following Expressions; *God was born, God suffered, God died*, Mary *was the Mother of God*; which was plainly disputing about Words only, or Expressions. It is true, *Cyril* charged *Nestorius* with the Doctrine of *Paul* of *Samosata*, for rejecting them; and *Nestorius*, *Cyril* with that of *Apollinaris*, for admitting them; but neither owned the Tenets, that were by the other

other aſcribed to him: So that *Cyril* was only a Heretic of *Neſtorius*'s making, and *Neſtorius* of *Cyril*'s: *Neſtorius* acknowleged a real Union between the Two Natures in Chriſt, and *Cyril* a real Diſtinction. But they did not, and, perhaps, when they were once warmed with diſputing, would not, underſtand one another. *Neſtorianiſm*, ſays a modern *Roman Catholic* Writer [f], *is but an imaginary Hereſy. Had* Neſtorius *and St.* Cyril *underſtood one another, they had agreed, and prevented the Scandal which their Quarreling brought on the Church. But the* Greeks *have always been great Diſputants; and it was by them that moſt of the firſt Hereſies were broached. The Subject of their Diſputes was, generally ſpeaking, ſome metaphyſical Speculation; and their Method of handling it arrant Chicanery. From equivocal Terms they drew falſe Inferences, and from Inferences paſſed to Injuries. Thus they became irreconcileable Enemies, and, forgetting Truth, ſought only to hurt one another. Had they but coolly explained their Thoughts, they had found, that in moſt Caſes no room was left, on either Side, for the Imputation of Hereſy.*

Neſtorianiſm *an imaginary Hereſy.*

In the preſent Diſpute *Cyril*, the more to oppoſe, or rather to provoke, *Neſtorius*, affected to uſe, on all Occaſions, not only the Expreſſions, which I have mentioned above, but others that ſeem to involve a ſtill more apparent Contradiction; *viz. The Eternal was born in Time, the Impaſſible ſuffered, the Immortal died, Life died.* At theſe Expreſſions the Orientals were no leſs ſhocked than *Neſtorius*; and therefore ſeparating themſelves from the Communion of *Cyril*, whom they concluded to have fallen into the Errors of *Apollinaris*, they inſiſted upon his either condemning or explaining the Expreſſions he uſed, before they would admit him to their Communion, or any, who communicated with him. He choſe the latter; and then it appeared, that they had been all fighting the whole time in the Dark; for by thoſe Expreſſions *Cyril* meant no more, than that Chriſt, who was God, was born, ſuffered, and died; that *Mary* was the Mother of Chriſt, who was God; the very Doctrine and Expreſſions which *Neſtorius* had been all along contending for, and *Cyril* had been combating with ſo much Warmth. But *Neſtorius* was already depoſed by the Faction of *Cyril*, and *Maximus* choſen and ordained Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* in his room.

Neſtorius *and* Cyril *agree in the Subſtance.*

[f] M. Simon. hiſt. crit. de la creance et des coutumes des nations du Levant.

The Expressions of *Cyril* were approved by the Council of *Ephesus*, and have therefore been adopted by the Church of *Rome*. But her Schoolmen, well apprised of the Objections to which they are liable, to excuse them from Blasphemy, have been obliged to recur to what they call a *Communication of Idioms*, in virtue of which the Properties of both Natures, say they, may be ascribed to the *Hypostasis* or Person, in whom both Natures were united. Thus we may say, according to them, *God was born*, *God suffered*, because the Person, who was God, *was born*, and *suffered*. Thus indeed they excuse the Expressions of *Cyril* from Blasphemy: But still it must be owned, that the Expressions used by *Nestorius*, *Christ was born*, *Christ suffered*, *Christ died*, were at least far more proper. For, after all, this *Communication of Idioms* is, in Fact, nothing else but a rhetorical Figure: So that *Cyril* spoke like an Orator, and *Nestorius* like a Philosopher: The Expressions of the former were, in a strict Sense, false and blasphemous; those of the latter, in the strictest Sense, true and orthodox: Tropes and Figures serve only to disguise the Truth, to lead Men into Errors, and therefore ought to be laid aside by all who seriously inquire after Truth, or explain it to others. I shall conclude with observing, that if by a *Communication of Idioms* the Properties of the Human and Divine Nature may be ascribed to the Person, in whom those two Natures were united; the Properties of the Body and Soul might, by a like Communication, be ascribed to the Person, in whom the Body and Soul are united: so that it might be said, with as much Propriety, *Man is immortal*, *Man will never die*, because the Soul is immortal, and will never die, as *God was mortal*, *God died*, because the Humanity was mortal and died. The Case is parallel, and the *Communication of Idioms* must justify both Expressions, or neither.

What meant by the Communication of Idioms.

The Expressions of Nestorius *more proper than those of* Cyril.

As to the Title of *Mother of God*, to which *Nestorius* had a more than ordinary Aversion, he seems to have rejected it on a particular Account; for the same Reason that induced *Clement* XI. to suppress the Title of *Grandmother of God*, which, in his time, began to be commonly given to St. *Anne*; *viz.* because *it was offensive to pious Ears*; *piarum aurium offensiva*. If the Virgin *Mary* was the Mother, St. *Anne* was, as properly speaking, the Grandmother of God. Why then should the Mother be robbed of so glorious a Title, while the Daughter is suffered to enjoy it? Why should *Nestorius* be deemed a Heretic for denying it to the Daughter, rather than

A particular Reason for rejecting the Title of Mother of God.

than *Clement* for denying it to the Mother? The one was as offenſive to the Ears of *Neſtorius*, as the other could poſſibly be to the Ears of *Clement*. However, the former did not conſult his Ears alone, but his Reaſon too, as has been ſhewn above; whereas the latter muſt have conſulted his Ears only, there being no Shadow of Reaſon, why the one Title ſhould be allowed, and not the other.

The Fate of Neſtorius.

As for *Neſtorius*, he received an Order from the Emperor, while the Council was ſtill ſitting, commanding him to quit *Epheſus*, and retire to the Monaſtery of St. *Euprepius* in the Suburbs of *Antioch*, where he had led a monaſtic Life before he was raiſed to the See of *Conſtantinople*. This Order he received with great Joy, having often declared, that he wiſhed for nothing ſo much as to ſpend his Life in Solitude and Retirement, far from the Troubles that threatened the Church [f]. In the Letter, which he wrote to *Antiochus* the *Præfectus Prætorio*, by whom the Emperor's Order was communicated to him, he told him, that to be thus depoſed, for ſtanding up in Defence of the Orthodox Faith, was a greater Honour than he had ever preſumed to aſpire to, or hoped to attain. The only Favour he begged of *Antiochus* was, that he would employ his whole Intereſt at Court, in order to obtain public Letters of the Emperor, that might be read in all the Churches, condemning the Doctrine of *Cyril* [g]. The following Year 432. *Celeſtine* wrote a very preſſing Letter to *Theodoſius*, dated the 15th of *March*, conjuring him, as he tendered the Purity of the Faith, to confine *Neſtorius* to ſome uninhabited Place, where it might not be in his Power to infect others with his peſtilential Doctrine; which was begging the Emperor to drive him out, like a wild Beaſt, from human Society, to periſh in a Deſart. He wrote, at the ſame time, a circular Letter to the Biſhops in thoſe Parts, exhorting them to ſecond him with all their Power and Intereſt at Court [h]. *Theodoſius*, hearkening only to the Impulſes of his own Good-nature, withſtood all the Solicitations of *Neſtorius*'s Enemies, for Four Years. But, in the End, being made to believe, that by ſhewing Mercy to ſuch an obſtinate Heretic, he rendered himſelf unworthy of Mercy; and that to treat him with Severity was the moſt effectual Means of drawing down the Bleſſings of Heaven upon himſelf, and the Empire; his Good-nature yielded, and he iſſued an Order, addreſſed to

He is ordered to return to his Monaſtery.

Is baniſhed into Arabia, *at the Requeſt of* Celeſtine, *and the Biſhops of his Party.*

[f] Evag. l. 1. c. 7. Concil. t. 3. p. 744. [g] Concil. app. p. 108. [h] Concil. l. 3. p. 1070, 1071.

Isidore, then the *Præfectus Prætorio*, injoining him to cause *Nestorius* to be conveyed to *Petra* in *Arabia*, to end his Days there, by way of Atonement for the Mischief he had done. With him were banished, to the same Place, Count *Irenæus*, his great Friend and Protector, and *Photius* a Presbyter of *Constantinople*, who had wrote in his Defence against *Cyril* [i]. The same Year the Emperor issued an Edict, dated the 30th of *July*, commanding the Disciples of *Nestorius* to be called *Simonians* (A); his Books to be every-where sought for, and publicly burnt; and all Persons, in whose Possession they were, to deliver them up to the Magistrates. By the same Edict the *Nestorians* were forbidden to hold any Assemblies in the Cities, Villages, or in the Fields, and the Places were confiscated, where such Assemblies should be held, as well as the Estates of those who should frequent them [k]. This Edict was published both in *Greek* and in *Latin*, that it might be understood by the Subjects of both Empires.

His Books forbidden and ordered to be burnt.

Is frequently removed from one Place to another.

The Enemies of *Nestorius* were not yet satisfied; they thought his Confinement to *Petra* too mild a Punishment; and therefore before he had been long there, they prevailed upon the Emperor to remove him from *Petra* to *Oasis*, in the Desarts between *Egypt* and *Libya*, a Place to which the greatest Criminals were usually confined in those Days [l]. He was still in *Oasis*, when *Socrates* wrote, that is, in 439 [m]. but the Town, being soon after surprised by the Barbarians, named *Blemmyes*, he was carried by them into Captivity, but set again at Liberty, and even informed by them, that the Town would, in a short time, be attacked anew by another Clan of Barbarians. Upon this Information he withdrew to the City of *Panopolis*, and immediately acquainted the Governor of *Thebais* with the Motives that had induced him to quit the Place, which he had been confined to by the Imperial Edict, intreating *his Highness (Celsitudinem tuam)* to notify them to the Emperor, and suffer him to con-

[i] Concil. ib. p. 1058, 1059. & ap. p. 884. [k] Cod. Theod. t. 6. p. 190. Concil. t. 3. p. 1200. [l] Socr. l. 7. c. 34. [m] Idem ib.

(A) The Emperor ordered them to be so called, merely to render them odious; for there was not the least Affinity between the Heresy of *Simon* the Magician, and the Doctrine that was ascribed to *Nestorius*. In this *Theodosius* followed the Example of his Predecessor *Constantine*, who, to disgrace the *Arians*, and prejudice the Populace against them, ordered them to be called *Porphyrians*. For when a Man was once declared a Heretic, all Means of rendering him infamous were deemed just and lawful. But neither Edict ever took place.

tinue there till his Pleaſure was known. But the Governor happened to be a zealous Catholic, or rather a true Courtier; and therefore, without waiting for the Emperor's Order, he ſent a Band of Soldiers to convey, or rather to drag him to *Elephantine*, on the moſt diſtant Borders of his Government. This the Governor ſeems to have done on Purpoſe to deſtroy him, and thereby ingratiate himſelf both with the Church, and the Court. For the Soldiers he employed on this Occaſion, were not *Romans*, but *Barbarians*; and when they were got above half-way to *Elephantine*, they were injoined, by a Counter-order from him, to bring their Priſoner back to *Panopolis* with all poſſible Expedition. As he was hurried on by the mercileſs Barbarians, notwithſtanding his old Age, the Weakneſs attending it, and the Hurts he received from a Fall, he arrived at *Panopolis*, quite ſpent, and ſo worn out with the Fatigues of that painful Journey, that no one thought he could outlive it many Days. But the Governor was impatient to hear the News of his Death; and therefore, before he could recruit his Strength, quite exhauſted by this Journey, he obliged him to undertake another, ordering him to repair, without Delay, to a certain Place within the Territory of *Panopolis*. As he outlived this Journey too, the Governor, bent on having the Merit and Glory of deſtroying the pretended Hereſiarch, ordered him immediately to undertake a Fourth; and this put an End to all his Troubles. For Nature ſinking under the Fatigues he was forced to undergo, without Intermiſſion or Reſpite, his Strength quite failed him, and he died [k] (A).

Treated with great Barbarity.

His Death.

Such were the Sufferings, ſuch was the End, of the famous *Neſtorius*; and both reflect no ſmall Diſgrace on the Eccleſiaſtics of thoſe Times, eſpecially on *Celeſtine* and *Cyril*; for by them this cruel Perſecution was raiſed, and by them it was carried on; the Laymen being only the Miniſters of their Cruelty and Revenge. Such a Treat-

Neſtorius *himſelf a cruel Perſecutor.*

[k] Evagr. l. 1. c. 7.

(A) An anonymous Writer, quoted by *Evagrius* (1), relates, that before *Neſtorius* died, his Tongue was devoured by Vermin, which he interprets as a Puniſhment juſtly inflicted on him for the Blaſphemies he ſuppoſes him to have uttered. This Account *Evagrius* ſeems not to have credited; but *Theodorus* the Reader, *Theophanes*, and *Theodoret*, have taken it upon the Word of the anonymous Writer, by whom it was probably invented to render the Name of the pretended *Hereſiarch* odious to Poſterity.

(1) Evag. l. 1. c. 7.

ment

ment was quite undeserved by *Nestorius*, with respect to his Doctrine, as I have shewn already, but was not so, it must be owned, in another respect: for he was himself a most furious Persecutor of all those, who had the Misfortune to be stigmatized with the Name of Heretics; and it is not to be doubted, but *Cyril* would have met with the same Treatment at his Hands, had his Party prevailed, as he did at *Cyril's*. In the Sermon, which he preached on the very Day of his Ordination, he thus addressed the Emperor, who was present: *Make the Orthodox Faith, O mighty Prince, reign alone on the Earth; and I will make you reign in Heaven. Lend me your Assistance to exterminate the Heretics, and I will lend you mine to exterminate the* Persians [l]. This was proclaiming War against all who dissented from him; and the War, thus proclaimed, he began, without Loss of Time, and pursued with the utmost Fury, causing the Imperial Laws against Heretics to be vigorously executed, and stirring up the Mob, not only in *Constantinople*, but in the neighbouring Provinces, against Dissenters of all Denominations. This occasioned an universal Confusion, and in some Places, a great deal of Bloodshed; insomuch that the Emperor was obliged to interpose his Authority, and protect, to a certain Degree, as Friends to the State, those whom the Bishop was for exterminating as Enemies to the Church. I will not presume to interpret the Severity that was practised upon him, as a Judgment from Heaven for the Severity, which he had practised upon others; agreeably to those Words of our Saviour, *With what Measure ye meet, it shall be measured to you* [m]; but I cannot help looking upon the Treatment he met with, however severe, as a just and well-deserved Retaliation; and upon him as a Man altogether unworthy of our Compassion.

The Doctrine of the Jansenists *approved by* Celestine.

But to return to *Celestine*: In the Year 431. he wrote to the *Gallican* Bishops, exhorting them to stand up in Defence of the Doctrine of St. *Austin*, and to silence, with their Authority, all who opposed it: for it was opposed by many, and among the rest, by the famous *Cassian*, as utterly inconsistent with Merit and Freewill. To this Letter are commonly annexed Nine Articles concerning Grace and Freewill; and, in these Articles, styled there, *The Authorities of the Bishops of the Holy Apostolic See*, is contained, in the most plain

[l] Socr. l. 7. c. 29. [m] Mark iv. 24.

and expreſs Terms, the Doctrine of the *Janſeniſts*, condemned in our Days by the famous Bull *Unigenitus* of *Clement* XI n. It is true, ſome pretend thoſe Articles to be falſly aſcribed to *Celeſtine*. But they have paſſed for his, ever ſince the Sixth to the preſent Century: they have been placed among his Decrees, by *Dionyſius Exiguus*; were quoted as his by *Petrus Diaconus* in 519. by *Creſconius* an *African* Biſhop towards the End of the Sixth Century, and by all, who have had Occaſion to mention them ſince that time.

The ſame Year died St. *Palladius*, the Firſt Biſhop of *Ireland*. He belonged to the *Roman* Church, and had been ſent by *Celeſtine*, ſome Years before into *Britain*, to ſtop the Progreſs of the *Pelagian* Hereſy in this Iſland. From *Britain* he had paſſed over into *Ireland* (A); and, having converted there ſome of the Inhabitants, he returned to *Rome*, to beg of *Celeſtine*, that a Biſhop might be ſent thither. *Celeſtine* complied with his Requeſt, ordained him Firſt Biſhop of *Ireland*, and ſent him back into that Iſland. Thus *Proſper*, who lived at this very time o. The *Iriſh* Writers tell us, that, finding their Countrymen, whoſe Converſion was reſerved by Heaven for St. *Patric*, very obſtinate, he abandoned the Iſland, and died in the Coun-

Palladius *the Firſt Biſhop of* Ireland.

n See the Works of St. Leo, by F. Queſnel, and Du Pin, Biblioth. eccl. t. 3. part. 2.
o Proſp. in Coll. c. 41. & chron.

(A) *Proſper* writes, that he was ſent *ad Scotos*; whence the *Scotch* Writers conclude him to have been ſent into *Scotland*, and the *Scots* have long looked upon him as the Apoſtle of their Nation. But that he was ſent into *Ireland*, and not into *Scotland*, is manifeſt from *Proſper*'s own Words. For ſpeaking of *Celeſtine*, by whom *Palladius* was ſent into *Britain* to make head againſt the *Pelagians*; *while he endeavoured*, ſays he, *to maintain the* Roman *Iſland Catholic, he made a barbarous Iſland Chriſtian* (1). The Iſland therefore, which he *made Chriſtian*, was a different Iſland from that of *Britain*; and conſequently could not be *Scotland*. The Inhabitants of *Ireland* began, as early as the Fourth Century, to be known by the Name of *Scoti* or *Scots*; ſo that *Scoti* and *Hiberni* were but different Names of one and the ſame People. It is true, that St. *Patric*, in ſuch of his Writings, as have been judged by the Critics the moſt authentic, ſeems to diſtinguiſh the *Scoti* from the *Hiberni*, but that Diſtinction is only with reſpect to Merit and Rank; for he ſpeaks conſtantly of the former as Men of a ſuperior Rank to the latter. And indeed the Name *Hibernus*, tho' more antient by many Ages than that of *Scotus*, appears to have been in great Contempt among the neighbouring Nations in St. *Patric*'s Time (2). The *Hiberni* were perhaps the Mechanics, and the *Scoti* the Gentry, or Men who followed more noble Profeſſions. By the latter was afterwards founded the Kingdom of *Scotland*. *Bollandus* is of Opinion, that the *Hiberni* came originally from *Britain*, and were the firſt Inhabitants of *Ireland*; and that the *Scoti*, a more warlike Race, come from ſome other Country, ſubdued the *Hiberni*, as the *Saxons* did the *Britons* (3).

(1) Proſp. in Col. p. 410. (2) Boll. 17. Martii. (3) Boll. ibid.

try

try of the *Picts*, that is, in *Scotland*, on his Return to *Rome* [r]. His Body indeed was long worſhiped in *Scotland*; but that is no Proof of his having ever been there (A).

The ſame Writers tell us, that St. *Patrick* was at *Rome*, when *Celeſtine* received the News of the Death of *Palladius*; and that thereupon he ordained him Biſhop, on the 30th of *July* 432. about a Year after the Ordination of *Palladius*, whoſe Room he was ſent over to ſupply [s]. But that they are therein miſtaken, and that St. *Patric* was not ordained till many Years after the Death of *Celeſtine*, I ſhall ſhew hereafter.

Celeſtine did not long outlive *Palladius*; for he died the following Year 432. on the 26th of *July*, having governed the *Roman* Church Nine Years, Ten Months, and Seventeen Days [t]. Both he and *Cyril* have been ſainted, merely in Conſideration of their extraordinary Feats againſt *Neſtorius*, and thoſe who adhered to him; for Cruelty to Heretics was now a cardinal Virtue, capable of atoning for the greateſt Crimes. As for *Cyril*, he had no better Title to that Honour, than the Monk *Ammonius*, whom he ſainted, and publicly commended as a holy Martyr, becauſe he died on the Rack for having attempted, at the Head of Five hundred riotous Monks, to aſſaſſinate, and dangerouſly wounded, *Oreſtes* the Governor of *Alexandria*, in a Quarrel between him and *Cyril* (B). *Celeſtine* was buried in the Cœmetery

[r] Vid. Boll. 17. Martii. [s] Ib. ibid. [t] Proſper. ann. 432.

(A) The learned Archbiſhop *Uſher* will not allow *Palladius* to have been the Firſt Biſhop of *Ireland*; alleging againſt that Opinion ſeveral Fragments out of the Lives of *Iriſh* Saints, ſome of whom are ſaid to have been Biſhops, and to have converted many of their own Countrymen, as early as the Middle of the Fourth Century (5). From the Fragments he produces I cannot judge of the Pieces themſelves. But *Bollandus*, who ſeems to have peruſed them, maintains them to be of no earlier a Date than the Twelfth Century; and moſt of them to be fabulous, which indeed he proves undeniably by ſeveral Paſſages quoted from them (6). And can the Authority of ſuch Pieces invalidate, or indeed any-ways affect the Authority of *Proſper*, who tells us in expreſs Terms, that *Palladius* was ordained by *Celeſtine*, *the Firſt Biſhop of* Ireland? As for what the Primate offers to elude the Authority of *Proſper*, it is ſcarce worthy of Notice; *viz.* that the Word *Primus* is not to be found in the Edition of that Writer by *Du Cheſne*. For it is to be found, as *Uſher* himſelf owns, in all the other Editions, and even in *Bede*, as well as in every other Author, who has copied *Proſper*'s Chronicle.

(B) *The Biſhops of* Alexandria *had begun*, ſays *Socrates* (1), *to exceed the Limits of the Eccleſiaſtical Power, and intermeddle in Civil Affairs, imitating therein the Biſhop of* Rome, *whoſe ſacred Authority had long*

(5) Uſh. Brit. eccl. ant. p. 781—794. (6) Boll. 17 Martii. (1) Socr. l. 7. c. 7.

ſince

metery of *Priſcilla*, where he is ſaid to have cauſed the Hiſtory of the Council of *Epheſus* to be painted [u]. In the Year 820. Pope *Paſcal* I. cauſed

[u] Anaſt. p. 547.

ſince been changed into Dominion and Empire. The Governors of *Alexandria*, looking upon the Increaſe of the Epiſcopal Power, as a Diminution of the Civil, watched all Opportunities of mortifying the Biſhops, in order to reſtrain them within the Limits of the ſpiritual, and prevent their encroaching on the temporal Juriſdiction. But *Cyril*, from the very Beginning of his Epiſcopacy, bid Defiance to the civil Power, acting in ſuch Manner as ſhewed but too plainly, that he would be kept within no Bounds. For ſoon after his Inſtallation, he cauſed, by his own Authority, the Churches, which the *Novatians* were allowed to have in *Alexandria*, to be ſhut up, ſeized on the ſacred Utenſils, and plundering the Houſe of their Biſhop *Theopemptus*, drove him out of the City, ſtript of every thing he poſſeſſed (2). Not long after the *Jews*, who were very numerous in *Alexandria*, having one Night treacherouſly murdered ſeveral Chriſtians there, *Cyril* next Morning, by break of Day, put himſelf at the Head of the Chriſtian Mob, and, without the Knowlege of the Governor, took Poſſeſſion of the Synagogue, drove the *Jews* out of *Alexandria*, pillaged their Houſes, and allowed the Chriſtians, who were concerned with him in the Riot, to appropriate to themſelves all their Effects. This the Governor highly reſented, and not only rebuked *Cyril* very ſeverely for thus entrenching on his Juriſdiction, and uſurping a Power that did not become him; but wrote to the Emperor, complaining of him for ſnatching the Sword of Juſtice from him to put it into the Hands of the undiſcerning Multitude. This occaſioned a Miſunderſtanding, or rather an avowed Enmity, between *Cyril* and *Oreſtes*. With the former ſided the Clergy, the greater Part of the Mob, and the Monks; with the latter the Soldiery, and the better Sort of the Citizens. As the Two Parties were ſtrangely animated againſt each other, there happened daily Skirmiſhes in the Streets of *Alexandria*. For the *Alexandrians*, as *Socrates* obſerves (3), and is well known, were of all People the moſt ſeditious and ungovernable. The Friends of the Governor, generally ſpeaking, made their Party good, having the Soldiery on their Side. But one Day as *Oreſtes* was going out in his Chariot, attended by his Guards, he found himſelf very unexpectedly ſurrounded by no fewer than Five hundred Monks, come from the Mountains of *Nitria*, the Monks were, in thoſe Days, the ſtanding Army of the Biſhops; but are now of the Popes alone, who being ſenſible how ſerviceable ſuch a formidable Corps might prove to the Apoſtolick See, not only againſt the Laity, but the Biſhops themſelves, exempted them from their Juriſdiction, and made them immediately dependent on themſelves. But of the monkiſh Orders, their Founders, and Inſtitutions, I ſhall ſpeak at length on occaſion of their being firſt taken by the Popes into their Service. The *Nitrian* Monks in the Service of *Cyril*, having ſurrounded the Governor's Chariot, firſt diſperſed, with ſeveral Vollies of Stones, the ſmall Guard that attended it, then falling upon him, dangerouſly wounded him, and ſeem'd determined to put an End to the Quarrel between him and *Cyril*, by putting an End to his Life. But the Citizens, alarmed at his Danger, flew to his Reſcue, put the cowardly Monks to flight at their Firſt Appearance, and having ſeized on the Monk *Ammonius*, by whom *Oreſtes* had been wounded, delivered him into his Hands. The Governor to deter others from the like Attempts, and to mortify *Cyril*, whom he well knew to be at the Bottom of the Plot, cauſed the Monk to be tortured with ſo much Severity, that he expired on the Rack. But *Cyril*, partly out of Spite to the Governor, and partly to reward the Zeal, which the Monk had exerted in attempting to aſſaſſinate his Antagoniſt, cauſed him to be honoured as a holy Martyr, un-

(2) Id. ibid. (3) Socr. l. 7. c. 13.

caused his Body to be translated to the Church of St. *Praxedes*. And it is still worshiped both there and in the Cathedral of *Mantua* [w].

Thus

[w] Boll. Apr. 6.

der the Name of *Thaumasius*, being himself ashamed to pay him that Honour under the Name of *Ammonius* (4).

The Partisans of *Cyril*, alike mortified and enraged at the Death of *Ammonius*, resolved, at all Events, to revenge it; and the Person they singled out among the Friends of *Orestes* to wreak their Rage and Revenge on, was one, who, of all the Inhabitants of that populous City, deserved it the least. This was the famous, and so much celebrated, *Hypatia*, the Wonder of her Age for Beauty, Virtue, and Knowlege. She kept a public School of Philosophy in *Alexandria*, where she was born; and her Reputation was so great, that not only Disciples flocked from all Parts to hear her; but the greatest Philosophers used to consult her, as an Oracle, with respect to the most intricate and abstruse Points of Astronomy, Geometry, and the *Platonic* Philosophy, which she was particularly well versed in (5). Tho' she was very beautiful, and freely conversed with Men of all Ranks, yet those she conversed with were so awed by her known Virtue and Modesty, that none, but one of her own Disciples, ever presumed to shew in her Presence the least Symptom of Passion or Tenderness; and him she soon cured (6). *Orestes* entertained the highest Opinion of her Abilities, often consulted her, as the other Governors had done before him, and in all perplext Cases governed himself by her Advice. As she was the Person in *Alexandria*, whom he most valued, and in whose Company he took the greatest Delight, the Friends of *Cyril* to wound him in the most tender and sensible Part, entered into a Conspiracy to destroy the innocent Lady, and by her Death deprive him of that Comfort. This barbarous Resolution being taken, as she was one Day returning Home in her Chariot, a Band of the Dregs of the People, encouraged and headed by one of *Cyril*'s Ecclesiastics named *Peter*, attacked her in her Chariot, pulled her violently out of it, and throwing her on the Ground, dragged her to the great Church called *Cæsareum*. There they stript her naked, and with sharp Tiles, either brought with them, or found there, continued cutting, mangling, and tearing her Flesh, she bearing it with the greatest Firmness and Constancy, till Nature yielding to pain, she expired under their Hands. Her Death did not satisfy their Rage and Fury. They tore her Body in Pieces, dragged her mangled Limbs, with a thousand Outrages, through all the Streets of *Alexandria*, and then, gathering them together, burnt them in a Place called *Cineron* (7). Such was the End of the famous *Hypatia*, the most learned Person of the Age she lived in, and one of the best, tho' not a Christian. Who could believe Christians, nay, Ecclesiastics, not to say Bishops, capable in those early Times of such Barbarities? The Account which I have given from *Socrates* of the tragical End of *Hypatia*, is confirmed by *Damascius* in his Life of *Isidorus* the Philosopher, written towards the End of the present Century (8). He makes *Cyril* the Author of that barbarous Murder. But *Damascius*, say *Du Pin* and *Tillemont*, was a Pagan, and therefore deserves no Credit. I wish it could not be made out so easily as it may, that tho' a Pagan he deserves to be credited on this Occasion. The Mob was headed, in perpetrating that horrid Murder, by one of *Cyril*'s Ecclesiastics; and I do not find, that he was ever punished, or even reprimanded, by his Bishop, on that Score. When the Emperor was first acquainted by *Orestes* with what had happened, he expressed the greatest Indignation, and a firm Resolution to punish the Offenders with the utmost Severity. But *Edesius*, a Deacon of the Church of *Alexandria*, who resided

(4) Socr. l. 7. c. 14. (5) Soc. Ibid. Theophan. p. 70, 71. Suid. p. 976, 977. (6) Socr. et Suid. ibid. (7) Socr. l. 7. c. 14. (8) Suid. p. 977

Thus far the Hiſtory of the Popes has been merely Eccleſiaſtical, and therefore leſs entertaining: but, in the next Volume, the Affairs of the Church will begin very ſoon to be ſo interwoven with thoſe of the State, as to render the Hiſtory both Eccleſiaſtic and Civil. The Popes will ſoon make a very different Figure from that which they have hitherto made; no longer mere Biſhops, but Biſhops and Princes; and the Biſhop almoſt intirely loſt in the Prince; no longer contending only with their Collegues for Spiritual Power and Juriſdiction, but, at the ſame time, with the greateſt Monarchs for Dominion and Empire; nay, employing the Sword as well as the Keys, and heading, as directed by their Ambition or Intereſt, both Councils and Armies. We ſhall ſee the Weſtern Empire utterly extinct, and *Italy* ſucceſſively invaded, and partly held by the *Heruli*, by the *Goths*, by the *Greeks*, the *Lombards*, the *French*, the *Italians*, the *Germans*, and the *Normans*; and the Popes managing their Affairs, in all theſe Revolutions, with ſo much Art and Addreſs, as to reap, from moſt of them, ſome conſiderable Advantage for themſelves. Events more intereſting, though, in reality, not more important, than thoſe which the preſent Volume relates; and which, to the very End of this Hiſtory, will be ſucceeded by others, equally proper to excite the Attention even of ſuch Readers as ſeek for Amuſement alone.

at *Conſtantinople*, with the Character of *Cyril*'s Nuncio, having gained over the Miniſters, with the large Sums that were remitted to him (not by the Mob, or the Eccleſiaſtic who headed them; for he was only a Reader), the Emperor was not only appeaſed, but prevailed upon to grant a general Pardon to all, who were concerned in that Riot (9). But, by pardoning them, he drew down Vengeance from Heaven upon himſelf, ſays the Hiſtorian, and was deſervedly puniſhed in the Perſons of thoſe, who were moſt dear to him (10). He alludes perhaps to the unhappy End of *Valentinian* III. his Couſin and Son-in-law, who was mnrdered on the 17th of *March* 455, and to the Misfortunes, which the whole Imperial Family was involved in after his Death.

The Church of *Rome*, which has ſainted this Man, may think herſelf concerned in Honour to juſtify all his Proceedings; but ſurely the Church of *England* is not. I ſhall not therefore attempt ſuch a Vindication; but having truly and faithfully related the Facts from a cotemporary Hiſtorian, ſhall leave the Character of *Cyril* to be judged of from them, and content myſelf with wiſhing, that one, whoſe Zeal for the Chriſtian Religion was ſometimes meritorious, had better underſtood the true Bounds of that Zeal, and the true Spirit of that Religion, than he appears to have done upon many Occaſions.

(9) Suid. p. 977. Socr. ibid. (10) Socr. ibid.

The END *of the* FIRST VOLUME.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM